DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 023 SO 009 772

AUTHOR	Hahn, Carole L.; And Others
TITLE	Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	121p.; Figure 1 on page 14 and Table 1 on page 19 may not reproduce clearly in paper copy from EDRS due to small print type of original document
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302 ($4.00, SSEC Publication No. 200)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adoption (Ideas); Changing Attitudes; Curriculum Research; *Diffusion; Educational Innovation; Educational Research; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Dissemination; Information Utilization; Literature Reviews; *Social Studies; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*New Social Studies

ABSTRACT

Three studies are described which explore use of "new social studies" materials as of 1974. The term "new social studies" is given to materials and teaching approaches developed during the 1960s by projects which were largely funded by the United States Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. The three main chapters in this monograph describe studies that were originally unconnected but that all focused on the diffusion of the new social studies materials. The first study examined how potential adopters perceived the new social studies materials and how these perceptions were related to the potential adopters' attitudes toward the materials. Participants were 495 teachers, department chairpersons, and supervisors in Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and Georgia. The second study sought to determine how many teachers had heard of, examined, and were using new social studies materials. It related the respondents' levels of awareness and adoption to characteristics such as membership in professional organizations, academic majors, school size, and years of teaching experience. Respondents were 252 teachers from five midwestern states. The third study focused on educators who had adopted the materials, their characteristics, and their perceptions about the effectiveness of the materials compared to others they were using or had used. A sample of 980 responses from California, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut formed the basis for this study. A concluding chapter draws conclusions and suggests topics for future research. (Author/AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SSEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THREE STUDIES ON PERCEPTION AND UTILIZATION OF "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" MATERIALS

by

Carole L. Hahn
Gerald W. Marker
Thomas J. Switzer
and
Mary Jane Turner

Carole L. Hahn is Assistant Professor of Education at Emory University.

Gerald W. Marker is Associate Professor of Education and Associate Director of the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education at Indiana University.

Thomas J. Switzer is Assistant Professor of Education at the University of Michigan.

Mary Jane Turner is Staff Associate of the Social Science Education Consortium.

Copyright © 1977
Social Science Education Consortium
Boulder, Colorado

SO 009 772

Part of the material in this publication (Chapter 4) was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and previously published by the Social Science Education Consortium. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript for Chapter 4 was submitted to the National Council for the Social Studies for critical review and determination of professional competence. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Council for the Social Studies or the National Institute of Education.

ORDERING INFORMATION

This publication is available from:

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(ORDER PUBLICATION NO. 200)

It is also listed in *Resources in Education* and can be obtained in microfiche and hard copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, identified as SO 009 772. See *Resources in Education* for ordering information and ED number.

PREFACE

In this publication, three studies that originally were unconnected but which deal with very similar issues are brought together. All three deal with various aspects of perceptions and use of "new social studies" materials, adding to our analytical knowledge about an interesting and provocative era in the history of social studies. Gerald Marker has provided a very useful introduction and conclusion to the three studies, pointing out similarities, differences, and omissions in their approaches and conclusions.

In addition to reporting and comparing the three studies, this publication provides useful leads for those who might wish to pursue further the subject of educational change in general and change in the social studies in particular. Each of the five chapters contains introductory remarks about related background materials and citations of these materials. In particular, Marker comments in his introductory chapter on six other publications of the Social Science Education Consortium that deal with aspects of educational change, particularly but not exclusively focused on social studies.

Irving Morrissett
Executive Director
Social Science Education
Consortium

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface.....i

Table of Contents.....iii

Chapter 1: Introduction, by Gerald W. Marker.....1

Chapter 2: Familiarity with and Perceived Characteristics of "New Social Studies" Materials, by Carole L. Hahn.....9

Chapter 3: Dissemination and Implementation of Social Studies Project Materials, by Thomas J. Switzer, Malcolm A. Lowther, William M. Hanna, and Ralph D. Kidder.....29

Chapter 4: Utilization of "New Social Studies" Curriculum Programs, by Mary Jane Turner and Frances Haley.....53

Chapter 5: Conclusion, by Gerald W. Marker.....103

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

by
Gerald W. Marker
Indiana University

Diffusion of Social Studies Innovations

In the early 1960s the federal government moved into the curriculum development arena, first in the areas of science and mathematics and later in the social studies. Social studies materials ranging from week-length units to sequences spanning several years were produced and tested by projects funded by the United States Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. Compared to most other government programs, the projects were insignificant; in total they cost less than a bomber or two. When viewed against previous federal efforts in the curriculum materials arena, however, it was a major undertaking, mounted originally to help the United States catch up and keep up with Soviet educational and scientific achievements.

It was reasonable to expect that, as more and more new materials became available, interest in getting those items into the field would also increase. It quickly became apparent that the best materials in the world would be of little value if people in the schools were unaware of them. But, when the staffs of the social studies projects began to think about how they would diffuse what they had developed, they discovered that little was known about the diffusion of educational innovations. Much more was known about how the use of hybrid seed corn spread than about how one might best introduce social studies innovations to potential users. In the absence of reliable data, project directors, much like political campaign managers, resorted to a variety of strategies in the hope that something would work. Sample units were designed for use in preservice methods classes; newsletters and demonstrations were employed, along with summer workshops and pilot schools. It wasn't until the final reports of the various projects began to appear that some sketchy data became available concerning the relative merit of some of these diffusion devices.

In the meantime interest had been growing in adapting the concept of the county agricultural extension agent to educational diffusion problems. The labels given to such new roles--linking agents, field agents, educational extension agents, education information specialists--were indications of the influence of rural sociologists, who had done most of the research on diffusion of innovations up to this time. Guides and training manuals

for persons in such roles began to appear, lending further definition to their various roles (see, for example, Havelock 1973 and Havelock and Havelock 1973). If the solutions were not apparent, at least the problem was becoming better defined.

As activity in the area of educational change gathered momentum, a literature on change in social studies began to develop. For example, this publication is one in an expanding series published by the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) on educational change in general and change in social studies in particular. An earlier publication (1973) by Jwaideh and Marker, *Bringing About Change in Social Studies*, reviewed research on change and applied it to the social studies field. A series of guidelines for those wishing to bring about change in social studies appeared in Becker and Hahn, *Wingspread Workbook for Educational Change Agents* (1975). The conference that served as the basis for the Becker and Hahn workbook also provided the data for Carlson, Fox, and Stevens' *The Diffusion of Educational Innovation: Recommendations for Policy Makers and Administrators* (1975). The intergroup and interpersonal skills necessary for change were the subject for Lippitt's *Social Psychology: A Resource for Elementary and Secondary Educators* (1975). Walter Borg recommended an R, D, and D model of change in *Research-based Development: A Strategy for Educational Change in the 1970s* (1971); and in *The University Model and Educational Change* (1971), Richard B. Ford assessed the impact of the curriculum reform movement on the universities.

In addition to the SSEC publications, *Social Education*, the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, carried a special section on changing the teaching of social studies in the schools in its March 1973 issue.*

---

*The articles that composed this special issue on change were: The Staff of the Diffusion Project, Indiana University, "The Role of Diffusion in Social Studies Reform"; James Becker, "Organizing for Change: The Individual in the System"; William Pulliam, "At Jericho, the Walls Come Tumbling Down"; Emily S. Girault and Richard E. Gross, "Resource Personnel Workshops: A Team Approach to Educational Change"; Daniel E. Griffiths, "Can Critics Change the Schools?"; reactions by Larry Cuban; and Stephen L. Danielski, "ERIC Clearinghouse: Change and Education."

Though the number was small, a few dissertations began to examine the issue of change in the social studies. Some of these will be referred to later in relation to the three studies that form the body of this paper. What matters here is that the effort to study how change takes place in social studies is in its infancy.

Three Studies

The three studies reported here focus specifically on the diffusion of what have come to be called the "new social studies" materials. While these studies vary in design and scope, taken together they help answer an interrelated set of questions:

1) To what extent are potential adopters aware of the "new social studies" materials?

2) Where did those who are aware of the "new social studies" materials first learn about them?

3) To what extent have the "new social studies" materials been adopted?

4) What is the relationship between certain potential adopters' characteristics, such as age, professional status, courses taught, and their awareness and/or adoption of the new materials?

5) What is the relationship between the perceptions potential adopters have of the "new social studies" materials and their willingness to try and adopt such materials?

6) How do those who have adopted the new materials feel about how well the materials have "worked"?

As in any study, there are some disclaimers that are in order as one approaches these three studies. For example, none of the studies claims a national sample and their combined populations still leave the populous Eastern states underrepresented. The personality characteristics of adopters are missing, though research in other fields indicates that this is a powerful variable in adoption decisions.* Another important variable,

*Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, p. 364) cite a number of supportable generalizations involving the personality characteristics of adopters, such as their greater ability to deal with abstractions, lesser dogmatism, and greater empathy.

school climate, is also missing, though again the literature suggests that this is an important factor in the educational change process (for example, see Bambarger 1970 and Pincus 1974). Finally, the role of commercial publishers was not controlled for, though it is likely that such persons are key actors in the diffusion process. While studies that control for all of these variables are virtually unheard of, these limitations should be kept in mind as one reads the three studies reported here.

Despite the limitations just mentioned these three studies add considerably to what we know about how social studies materials are diffused. A key assumption of most curriculum developers in the sixties was that the materials available to teachers greatly shape what takes place in the nation's classrooms. The low level of scientific knowledge among young Americans in the 1950s was attributed, in part, to the use of inaccurate and uninteresting materials. Now, in the mid 1970s, alternatives in materials exist. Emphasis now shifts from the invention and trial of materials to their dissemination. New materials are only "alternatives" when they are known to potential adopters.

Anyone who has observed education soon realizes that ideas and products move through the system at a very uneven rate. The problem for the person planning a diffusion campaign is to know which variables are powerful enough to merit attention. As reliable answers to the six questions posed earlier become available--and the three studies reported here move us in that direction--educators will be able to make more judicious use of their time and efforts devoted to diffusion. Put another way, we will be in a position to "get more bang for our bucks."

The three studies reported here were all conducted at about the same time. The study by Carole Hahn (Chapter 2) involved 495 teachers, department chairpersons, and supervisors in four states: Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and Georgia. Its main focus was on how potential adopters perceived the "new social studies" materials and how those perceptions were related to the potential adopters' attitudes toward the materials.

The Switzer et al. study (Chapter 3) sampled 252 respondents from five Midwestern states. It sought to determine how many teachers had heard of, examined, and were using "new social studies" materials. The study also looked at how levels of awareness and adoption were related

to certain characteristics of respondents, such as their membership in professional organizations, their academic majors, the size of their schools, and years of teaching experience. Of the three studies this was the only one to look at the question of how many teachers had been trained to use the new materials.

The Turner-Haley study (Chapter 4) was the largest of the three and involved a sample of 980 responses from California, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut. The study concentrated upon those who had decided to adopt the new materials, their characteristics, and their perceptions concerning the effectiveness of the materials compared to others they were using or had used.

Taken together these three studies involved over 1,600 teachers, department heads, and supervisors in 11 states. They provide some interesting insights into the general question of who is doing what in social studies. Following the three chapters, each of which presents one of the studies in full detail, some general lessons to be learned from these studies are discussed (Chapter 5).

References

Bambarger, Richard E. "A Study of Organizational Climate, Faculty Belief Systems, and Their Relation to the Rate of Adoption of Educational Innovations in Selected School Districts." Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1970.

Havelock, Ronald G. *The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Havelock, Ronald G., and Mary C. Havelock. *Training for Change Agents: A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields.* Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

Pincus, John. "Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools." *Review of Educational Research,* Vol. 44, No. 1 (Winter 1974) pp. 113-144.

Rogers, Everett, and F. Floyd Shoemaker. *The Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach.* New York, NY: Free Press, 1971.

Social Education, Vol 37, No. 3 (March 1973) entire issue.

Chapter 2

FAMILIARITY WITH AND PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" MATERIALS

by

Carole L. Hahn

Emory University

This chapter is based on research conducted for the author's doctoral dissertation, "Relationships Between Potential Adopters' Perceptions of New Social Studies Materials and Their Adoption of Those Materials" (Indiana University, 1974), and a subsequent replication of that research done in Georgia and Florida.

By 1974, social studies educators were debating about whether the "new social studies" was still new. Some felt that the approach of teaching inquiry processes was generally accepted and that the "new social studies" materials were widely known. Others argued that still more efforts should be devoted to building awareness of the new ideas, practices, and products and to persuading people to adopt the innovations. There was little evidence to enlighten the debate. No studies had been conducted on the extent to which social studies innovations were known or on why some of the new materials had diffused more successfully than others.

The purpose of this study was, first, to determine if potential adopters of "new social studies" materials were familiar with the materials and, second, to determine if one variable--perceived innovation characteristics--was related to adoption of the materials. Perceived characteristics of the materials were selected for study because scholars in fields other than education had noted the importance of perceived attributes to the adoption of innovations (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 157). Even though the few studies that had been done on perceptions of innovation characteristics explained a large percentage of the variance in rate of adoption, this was one of the least-researched areas of innovation diffusion. A study of the relationships between perceived characteristics of "new social studies" materials and adoption of the materials would contribute to knowledge about why some innovations are adopted and others are not.

In addition to contributing to the knowledge base in diffusion, a study of the relationships between adopters' perceptions and adoption might have practical implications for developers and change agents. Discovering how adoption is related to adopters' perceptions of innovations might yield suggestions for the packaging of innovations and for strategies to diffuse innovations.

The Problem

The problem of this study was, first, to determine the extent to which potential adopters of "new social studies" materials were familiar with the materials and, second, to determine if their perceptions of the materials' characteristics were related to a willingness to adopt and to actual adoption of the materials. The purpose of this study was to seek

answers to the following questions:

1) To what extent are potential adopters of "new social studies" materials familiar with those materials?
2) What are the relationships between potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and their willingness to adopt those materials?
3) What are the relationships between potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and the actual adoption of those materials in their schools?
4) Is there a relationship between potential adopters' willingness to adopt new materials and adoption of those materials in their schools?

The Concepts

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) suggest that the five concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, observability, and complexity are useful in categorizing potential adopters' perceptions of innovations. They emphasize that it is "the attributes of a new product, not as seen by experts but as perceived by the potential adopters that really matters" (p. 137).

Relative advantage, as defined by Rogers and Shoemaker, is "the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supercedes" (p. 138). Further,

> relative advantage, in one sense, indicates the intensity of the reward or punishment resulting from adoption of an innovation. There are undoubtedly a number of subdimensions of relative advantage: the degree of economic profitability, low initial cost, lower perceived risk, a decrease in discomfort, a savings in time and effort, and the immediacy of the reward. This latter factor perhaps explains why preventive innovations have an especially low rate of adoption. Such ideas as buying insurance, using auto seat belts, getting innoculation against disease, adopting birth control methods, . . . are examples. (p. 139)

Studies on the diffusion of innovations indicate that perceptions of initial cost, continuing cost, risk, and profit affect adopters' willingness to try innovations. In this study, it was felt that anticipated effects on student interest and student learning would contribute to perceived relative advantage.

Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the salient existing values, past experiences, and needs of the receivers (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 145).

Trialability is the degree to which an innovation may be tried on a limited basis (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 155). Perceived divisibility, or the ability to try an innovation on a small scale or pilot basis, has been found to be important in several studies on the adoption of innovations.

Observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 155). Several studies conclude that being able to observe the results of using innovations have contributed to their adoption.

Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 154). Difficulty for teachers and for students may be barriers to the diffusion of social studies materials.

The Materials Information Questionnaire (Hahn 1974b) was developed to measure subdimensions of perceptions suggested by this literature. The questionnaire was fieldtested to establish its reliability and to identify items for revision.

Hypotheses

The first major hypothesis (1.0) was that potential adopters of new social studies materials would be familiar enough with at least one of the 22 titles on the "New Social Studies Materials List" (Figure 1 on the next page) to identify the materials' characteristics.

A second major hypothesis (2.0) was that there would be correlations between various subdimensions of potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and their willingness to adopt those materials. Subhypotheses dealing with each of the subdimensions included the following:

--Potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations as having relative advantage would correlate positively with potential adopters' being willing to adopt those innovations (2.1). Perceptions of low initial cost (2.1.1), low continuing cost (2.1.2), low

Figure 1.

NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS LIST

1) *New Dimensions in American History* series published by D.C. Heath, Amherst College, The Committee on the Study of History, Units in American History, Richard Brown and Van Halsey, eds.

2) *Patterns in Human History*, multimedia kits published by The MacMillan Company, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Malcolm Collier, University of Chicago.

3) *Asian Studies Inquiry Program*, published by Field Educational Publications, University of California at Berkeley, John Michaelis and Robin McKeown.

4) Social Studies Unit Books (*Political Parties, Our Polluted World, Anthropology in Today's World, Black in America*, etc.), American Education Publishers, Xerox.

5) *World Studies Inquiry Series*, Field Educational Publications, University of California at Berkeley, Robin McKeown.

6) *Voices for Justice* and *Conflict, Politics and Freedom*, published by Ginn and Co., University of California, Los Angeles, Charles Quigley and Richard Longaker.

7) *The Americans: A History of the U.S.* and *Living in Urban America*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Carnegie-Mellon University, Slow Learner Project, Edwin Fenton.

8) *Comparative Political Systems, Comparative Economic Systems, The Shaping of Western Society, Tradition and Change in Four Societies, A New History of the U.S., The Humanities in Three Cities*, and *Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Carnegie-Mellon University, Edwin Fenton.

9) *The People Make A Nation*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Marvin W. Sandler, Edwin C. Roswenc, Edward C. Martin.

10) *From Subject to Citizen*, Denoyer-Geppert Co., Education Development Center, Franlkin Patterson, Arleigh Richardson, and Nona Plessner Lyons.

11) Units for grades 9-12, Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia, Marion Rice and Wilfred D. Bailey.

12) *Public Issues Series*, Harvard Social Studies Project, American Education Publishers, Fred Newmann and Donald Oliver.

13) *Geography in an Urban Age*, High School Geography Project, Nicholas Helburn, Macmillan.

14) *American Political Behavior*, Ginn and Company, Indiana University High School Curriculum Center in Government, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick.

15) *Inquiry into Crucial American Problems Series*, Prentice Hall, Series Editor, Jack Fraenkel.

16) *Justice in Urban America*, Houghton-Mifflin, Law in American Society Foundation, Robert Ratcliffe.

17) *Manpower and Economic Education: Opportunities in American Life*, Ohio University, Robert Darcy and Phillip Powell.

18) *Economics in Society*, Addison Wesley, Suzanne Wiggins Helburn and John Sperling.

19) *World History Through Inquiry Series*, Rand McNally, Byron Massialas and Jack Zevin.

20) Sociological Resources for the Social Studies, Allyn and Bacon, University of Michigan, Robert Angell--*Episodes, Inquiries in Sociology, Readings in Sociology Series.*

21) *High School Social Studies Program*, Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, John S. Gibson--38 Case Studies.

22) *Analysis of Public Issues*, Utah State University, James Shaver and Guy Larkins.

risk (2.1.3), savings in time and effort (2.1.4), increased student interest (2.1.5), and increased student learning (2.1.6) would have positive correlations with potential adopters' willingness to adopt the innovations.

--Potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations as being compatible with felt need (2.2.1), previous experience (2.2.2), and values (2.2.3) would correlate positively with potential adopters' being willing to adopt the innovations.

--Perceptions of trialability (2.3) and observability (2.4) would correlate positively with potential adopters' willingness to adopt the innovations.

--Perceived complexity--including difficulty of teacher understanding (2.5.1), difficulty of teacher use (2.5.2), difficulty of student understanding and use (2.5.3), and dependence on teachers' having particular skills (2.5.4)--would have a negative correlation with potential adopters' willingness to adopt the innovation.

A third major set of hypotheses (3.0) dealt with the relationships between subdimensions of potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and the actual adoption of those materials by their schools. It was hypothesized that:

--Perceptions of relative advantage--including low initial and continuing cost (3.1.1 and 3.1.2), low risk (3.1.3), savings in time and effort (3.1.4), and increased student interest and learning (3.1.5 and 3.1.6)--would have a positive correlation with adoption of the innovations.

--Potential adopters' perceptions of compatibility with felt need (3.2.1), previous experience (3.2.2), and values (3.2.3) would have positive correlations with adoption of the innovations in their schools.

--Perceptions of trialability (3.3) and observability (3.4) would correlate positively with the adoption of the innovations within their schools.

--Perceived complexity--including difficulty of teacher understanding (3.5.1), difficulty of teacher use (3.5.2), difficulty of student

understanding and use (3.5.3), and dependence on teacher's having particular skills (3.5.4)--would have a negative correlation with adoption.

A fourth major hypothesis was that there would be a positive correlation between potential adopters' willingness to adopt social studies innovations and actual adoption of those innovations in their schools.

Procedures

From the schools listed in the Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and Georgia school directories as having grades 9, 10, 11, or 12, 250 schools were identified in each state, using a table of random numbers. Letters were sent to the principals of the 1,000 schools explaining the study and asking each principal to name the person or persons who had the most influence in the selection of social studies materials for his or her school. An accompanying questionnaire asked for some demographic data on the school.

Of the 1,000 principals, 225 (90 percent) of the Indiana principals, 185 (74 percent) of the Ohio principals, 193 (77 percent) of the Florida principals, and 201 (80 percent) of the Georgia principals returned questionnaires for use. In a few cases, more than one principal named the same person as being influential in selecting social studies materials for their schools. In other cases, a principal named several people. A few principals did not name anyone.

In total, 216 individuals were named by Indiana principals, 257 were named by Ohio principals, 216 were named by Florida principals, and 222 were named by Georgia principals. Letters, directions, and questionnaires were sent to the 473 people identified by Indiana and Ohio principals in the spring of 1973 and to the 438 individuals named by Florida and Georgia principals in the spring of 1974. These potential adopters of secondary social studies materials were asked to identify materials on the "New Social Studies Materials List" with which they were familiar. They were then to fill out up to three Materials Information Questionnaires (Hahn 1974b), one for each set of materials with which they were familiar. Fifty-four percent of the Indiana people, 38 percent of the Ohio people,

66 percent of the Florida people, and 64 percent of the Georgia people returned questionnaires. The resulting sample of potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio in the spring of 1973 consisted of 209 individuals. The Southern sample consisted of 286 potential adopters from Georgia and Florida in the spring of 1974.

Several different kinds of statistical analyses were performed on the data obtained from the principals' and potential adopters' questionnaires. Responses to the 28 items on the Materials Information Questionnaire were factor analyzed, using a varimax rotation method. The factor analysis was performed to determine if the concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability, and complexity did in fact represent distinct categories of perceptions that contained the various subdimensions suggested by the literature.

Kendall rank correlations were used to test the hypotheses relating perceptions to willingness and to adoption and relating willingness to adopt an innovation to the adoption of that innovation.

Chi square values were computed for the differences in demographic variables between respondents who said they were not familiar with any of the titles and those who were familiar enough with some of the materials to complete a Materials Information Questionnaire for at least one title on the list.

Results

To what extent are potential adopters familiar with the new materials? Eighty-three (40 percent) of the respondents in the Midwestern sample and 138 respondents (49 percent) in the Southern sample said they were not familiar with *any* of the materials on the "New Social Studies Materials List" and, therefore, they could not fill out any Materials Information Questionnaires. A total of 231 usable questionnaires were returned from 126 different potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio, and 304 usable questionnaires were returned from 286 different potential adopters in Florida and Georgia.

A chi square analysis of the differences between respondents who were familiar with new social studies materials and those who were not

familiar with the materials indicated that there were no significant differences in community and occupational levels, in school enrollment and organization, and in per pupil expenditures between the two groups. It was found that potential adopters who were familiar with the materials tended to come from more urban and suburban communities and from schools with larger graduating classes than did respondents who were not familiar with the materials, as can be seen in Table 1 on the next page.

Familiarity with Materials

What materials were identified most often by potential adopters as being ones with which they were familiar enough to rate the materials' characteristics? Potential adopters completed one, two, or three Materials Information Questionnaires on materials with which they were familiar enough to rate perceived characteristics. Frequency distributions of the materials identified by respondents from each state were computed as shown in Table 2 on page 20.

The Carnegie-Mellon materials were the ones most frequently identified by the Southern respondents and they were the second most frequently identified by Midwestern respondents. They were some of the earliest materials available that incorporated the ideas of the "new social studies." Being around longer and being first may have increased their visibility. In addition, the Carnegie-Mellon project produced materials for most subjects taught in U.S. high schools.

In states with a textbook adoption policy, it appears that materials on the adopted list have a greater visibility than do materials not listed. The Carnegie-Mellon materials had at one time been on the list in Georgia and *American Political Behavior* was on the Georgia list. The materials most frequently named by Florida respondents, the Carnegie program, *People Make a Nation*, *Justice in Urban America*, and *The Americans*, were all on the state adopted list. The Fenton materials were the only ones on the "New Social Studies Materials List" which were on the Indiana state adopted list at the time and they were the second most frequently named materials in that state.

The Harvard Project materials, which had been available longer than most of the other materials, were the ones most frequently mentioned in

Table 1

Differences Between Schools of Respondents Who Were Not Familiar with New Social Studies Materials and Schools of Potential Adopters Who Were Familiar with the Materials

	Indiana-Ohio		Georgia-Florida	
	Familiar %	Not Familiar %	Familiar %	Not Familiar %
Community type				
1. Urban	31	16	22	20
2. Suburban	31	18	38	20
3. Urban/Suburban	2	0	3	0
4. Small town	12	26	15	24
5. Rural	19	34	18	28
6. Small town/Rural	5	6	5	7
	100, n=121	100, n=82	101, n=146	99, n=137
	x^2 = 18.263 (5df)**		x^2 = 18.905 (5df)**	
Community Educational Level				
1. College graduate	7	1	9	5
2. Attended college	7	5	13	6
3. High school graduates	64	79	53	47
4. Mixed H.S. grads/attended H.S.	10	5	7	7
5. Did not graduate from H.S.	12	8	18	35
	100, n=112	98, n=73	100, n=129	100, n=121
	x^2 = 6.183 (4df)		x^2 = 11.677 (4df)*	
Community Occupational Level				
1. Professional or technical, self-employed, business managers, & officials	21	16	35	19
2. Clerical & sales, skilled workers, farmers	46	45	38	45
3. Laborers, service workers	32	40	28	36
	99, n=87	101, n=58	101, n=104	100, n=94
	x^2 = 1.7287 (2df)		x^2 = 6.021 (2df)*	
Number of students in graduating class				
1. More than 500	15	11	20	12
2. 251-500	34	22	35	22
3. 100-250	31	33	33	39
4. Fewer than 100	20	35	12	27
	100, n=123	101, n=83	100, n=137	100, n=119
	x^2 = 8.0403 (3df)*		x^2 = 15.396 (3df)**	
Expenditure per pupil				
1. More than $1000	8	2	9	5
2. $900 - $999	7	4	17	8
3. $800 - $899	14	22	8	11
4. $700 - $799	33	22	21	26
5. $600 - $699	22	36	16	21
6. $500 - $599	11	15	19	21
7. Less than $500	5	0	10	8
	100, n=88	101, n=55	100, n=77	100, n=62
	x^2 = 11.8097 (6df)		x^2 = 4.544 (6df)	

* Significant at .05 level, but not .01 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

Table 2

Questionnaires Completed for Each Set of Materials in the Four States

Materials Rated	States									
	Indiana		Ohio		Georgia		Florida		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. New Dimensions (Amherst)	4	3.3	3	2.7	4	3.4*	2	1.1	13	2.4
2. Patterns in Human History (ACSP)	4	3.3	4	3.6	3	2.6	7	3.7*	18	3.4
3. Asian Studies Inquiry	1	.8	1	.9	5	4.3	4	2.1*	11	2.1
4. Social Studies Unit Books (Xerox)	10	8.3	6	5.4	11	9.5	17	9.0	44	8.2
5. World Studies Inquiry	1	.8	0	0	1	.9	0	0*	2	.4
6. Voices for Justice	0	0	1	.9	2	1.7	2	1.1	5	.9
7. The Americans (Carnegie-Mellon)	2	1.7	8	7.2	11	9.5	19	10.1*	40	7.5
8. Comparative (Carnegie-Mellon)	21	17.5*	17	15.3	28	24.1	53	28.2*	119	22.2
9. People Make a Nation	2	1.7	10	9.0	8	6.9	31	16.5*	51	9.5
10. Subject to Citizen (EDC)	1	.8	2	1.8	0	0	2	1.1	5	.9
11. Units for grades 9-12 (Georgia Anthropology)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.1	2	.4
12. Public Issues Series (Harvard Project)	38	31.7	30	27	8	6.9	7	3.7	83	15.5
13. Geography in an Urban Age (HSGP)	7	5.8	6	5.4	5	4.3	5	2.7*	23	4.3
14. Am. Political Behavior	12	10.0	8	7.2	15	12.9*	6	3.2*	41	7.7
15. Inquiry into Crucial Am. Problems	1	.8	6	5.4	2	1.7	2	1.1*	11	2.1
16. Justice in Urban Am.	4	3.3	5	4.5	1	.9	20	10.6*	30	5.6
17. Manpower & Econ. Ed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Econ. in Society	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. World History through Inquiry	0	0	0	0	1	.9	3	1.6*	4	.7
20. Sociological Resources for Social Studies	12	10.0	4	3.6	10	8.6	6	3.2*	32	6.0
21. High School Social Studies (Lincoln Filene)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Analysis of Public Issues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total									534	100

*Material on the State Adopted Textbook List; Ohio does not have statewide adoption.

Ohio and Indiana. However, they were not mentioned very much in the two Southern states, where they were not on the state adopted lists. Further, the Harvard Project far surpassed the Xerox Unit Books in percent of responses in the Midwest, but it was mentioned less often than the Unit Books in the Southern states. The two sets of materials are printed in the same format, they have the same low price, and they are distributed by the same publisher. The major difference is that the Harvard Project materials focus on issues of public controversy and the Unit Books do not. As one Georgia department head said, "My supervisor doesn't even tell most of the schools about those because they are so controversial."

Perceptions and Willingness to Adopt

What are the relationships between potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and their willingness to adopt those materials? A factor analysis of responses to the Materials Information Questionnaire yielded factors that were different from Rogers' concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability and complexity (Hahn 1974a). Therefore, it did not make sense to correlate the five concepts with willingness to adopt. However, it would still be fruitful to correlate the hypothesized subdimensions of perceptions with potential adopters' willingness to try the new materials. Correlations between subdimensions and willingness to adopt were computed to test hypotheses 2.1 through 2.5. The results are displayed in Table 3 on the next page.

As had been hypothesized, there were positive correlations, relatively strong, between willingness to adopt and perceptions that the material was better than previous material, that student interest would be greater, that student learning would be greater, that the package, content, and approach or methods were needed, that it teaches valued things, and that learning would be observable to the teacher.

Also as hypothesized there were positive correlations between potential adopters' willingness to adopt and their perceptions of low cost, low risk, ability to try the innovation on a small scale, and observability to parents. However, the correlations were not very strong.

Table 3

Correlations Between Subdimensions of Potential Adopters' Perceptions of "New Social Studies" Materials and Their Willingness to Adopt Those Materials

Hypothesis Number	Perception Subdimensions (From Items on Materials Information Questionnaire)	Correlation with Willingness to Adopt--Indiana and Ohio (n)	Correlation with Willingness to Adopt--Florida and Georgia (n)
2.1	Better than previous material	.63** (221)	.63** (286)
2.1.1	Initial cost low	.16** (223)	.08* (286)
2.1.2	Continuing cost low	.15** (223)	.15** (289)
2.1.3	Low risk in community	.13* (227)	.05 (290)
	Low risk on standardized tests	.19** (223)	.32** (285)
	Low risk of lessons failing	.32** (225)	.36** (288)
2.1.4	More teacher time & effort--at first	-.14* (228)	.01 (294)
	More teacher time & effort--continued	-.03 (226)	-.14** (292)
2.1.5	Student interest greater	.57** (221)	.64** (290)
2.1.6	Student learning greater	.55** (223)	.55** (284)
2.2.1	Package needed	.41** (224)	.44** (294)
	Approach or methods needed	.48** (226)	.26** (296)
	Content needed	.53** (224)	.51** (291)
	Fits a course	.30** (226)	.45** (293)
2.2.2	Content similar to previous material	-.18** (227)	.01 (293)
	Approach similar to previous material	.03 (228)	.10** (292)
2.2.3	Teaches valued things	.53** (227)	.52** (296)
2.3	Limited experiment possible	.09 (228)	.17** (289)
	Trial on small scale possible	.19** (226)	.26** (295)
2.4	Results observable to other teachers	.28** (227)	.26** (280)
	Results observable to parents	.35** (224)	.25** (279)
	Learning observable to teacher	.57** (222)	.63** (284)
2.5.1	Not easy for teacher to understand	-.20** (225)	-.24** (295)
2.5.2	Difficult for teachers to use	-.16** (226)	-.19** (295)
2.5.3	Reading level difficult	-.11* (226)	-.13** (296)
	Tasks difficult for students	-.12* (224)	-.15** (292)
	Content difficult for students	-.18* (226)	-.21** (293)
2.5.4	Teacher needs special skills	.06 (224)	-.10** (294)

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Overall there were negative correlations between the complexity subdimensions of perception and willingness to adopt, as hypothesized. But the correlations were weak and, in one case (Georgia/Florida), the relationship was positive.

There was little or no correlation between perceived similarity with previous experience and willingness to try an innovation. Apparently potential adopters do not base their decisions on whether an innovation is similar to something they have used before.

The relationships between perceived time and effort and willingness to adopt were mixed and the correlations were very weak.

Perceptions and Adoption

What are the relationships between potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and the adoption of those materials in their schools? Since Rogers' categories were not empirically supported by a factor analysis, it was not appropriate to correlate them with adoption. But it was possible and appropriate to correlate the perception subdimensions with adoption. Those correlations were used to test hypothesis 3.1 through 3.5. Results are shown in Table 4 on the next page.

None of the hypotheses relating subdimensions of perceptions to actual adoption of the "new social studies" materials was borne out. All correlations between perceptions and adoption were extremely weak and, in many cases, were in opposite directions (both positive and negative) for the two studies.

Willingness to Adopt and Adoption

Correlations between potential adopters' willingness to adopt "new social studies" materials and actual adoption of those materials by their schools are shown in Table 5 on page 25. There were weak correlations between willingness and actual adoption in the two Midwestern states and little or no relationship between willingness and adoption in the two Southern States. The strongest positive correlation between willingness and adoption was obtained in Ohio, the only one of the four states without a state textbook adoption policy. Several respondents in Indiana, Georgia,

Table 4

Correlations Between Subdimensions of Potential Adopters' Perceptions of "New Social Studies" Materials and Adoption of Those Materials by Their Schools

Hypothesis Number	Perception Subdimensions (From Items on Materials Information Questionnaire)	Correlation with Adoption--Indiana and Ohio (n)	Correlation with Adoption--Florida and Georgia (n)
3.1	Better than previous material	.11* (224)	-.10** (291)
3.1.1	Initial cost low	.20** (226)	-.15** (290)
3.1.2	Continuing cost low	.16** (226)	-.18** (293)
3.1.3	Low risk in community	.02 (230)	-.09** (295)
	Low risk on standardized tests	-.10 (226)	.00 (290)
	Low risk of lessons failing	.02 (228)	.13** (293)
3.1.4	More teacher time and effort--at first	-.01 (231)	.05 (299)
	More teacher time and effort--continued	-.02 (220)	.02 (297)
3.1.5	Student interest greater	.15** (224)	-.09** (293)
3.1.6	Student learning greater	.15** (226)	-.12** (289)
3.2.1	Package needed	.15** (227)	-.12** (297)
	Approach or methods needed	.11* (229)	-.22 (300)
	Content needed	.11 (227)	-.14** (296)
	Fits a course	.25** (229)	-.12** (297)
3.2.2	Content similar to previous material	-.11* (230)	-.02 (298)
	Approach similar to previous material	-.08 (231)	-.06 (297)
3.2.3	Teaches valued things	.17** (230)	-.10** (301)
3.3	Limited experiment possible	.19** (230)	-.10** (293)
	Trial on small scale possible	.24** (229)	-.11** (300)
3.4	Results observable to other teachers	.04 (222)	.12** (284)
	Results observable to parents	.09 (227)	-.12** (283)
	Learning observable to teacher	.14* (224)	-.14** (287)
3.5.1	Not easy for teacher to understand	-.06 (228)	-.04 (300)
3.5.2	Difficult for teachers to use	-.03 (229)	.03 (300)
3.5.3	Reading level difficult	-.09 (229)	.07** (301)
	Tasks difficult for students	.00 (227)	-.01 (297)
	Content difficult for students	-.04 (229)	.07** (297)
3.5.4	Teacher needs special skills	.07 (227)	-.05 (298)

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 5

Correlations Between Potential Adopters' Willingness to Adopt "New Social Studies Materials and Adoption of Those Materials by the Potential Adopters' Schools	
Sample	Correlation Between Willingness to Adopt and Actual Adoption
Indiana (n = 120)	.2585
Ohio (n = 111)	.3453
Florida (n = 182)	-.1461
Georgia (n = 116)	-.0662

and Florida said they were not using the material, although they would like to, because it was not on the state adopted list. In all three states, it is possible to use supplemental funds to obtain materials not on the list, but it is rarely done, either because potential adopters do not perceive they have the necessary funds for purchase or because they believe they can purchase only from the state list. Some of the Ohio respondents were similarly affected by county adoption policies, which may explain why the correlation between willingness and adoption was not stronger than it was in a state without a statewide adoption policy.

Overall, the weak correlations between willingness and adoption may be because materials are used for several years, until they "wear out," whether or not they are currently the most desirable. Thus, there is a lag between attitude toward innovations and the opportunity for adoption. That idea was supported by responses to an open-ended item on the Materials Information Questionnaire.

Implications and Recommendations

Social studies change agents should note the large number of potential adopters who are not yet aware of the "new social studies" projects developed in the 1960s. The problem seems to be acute particularly in

rural areas and small towns where schools have small graduating classes. Since it is not profitable for commercial publishers to send representatives to small schools at great distances from one another, the task of informing those potential adopters of new developments will fall to government agencies and professional organizations.

There are several indications that state textbook adoption policies affect diffusion of social studies innovations. In states with textbook adoption policies, materials not on the list seem to be less widely known than are ones on the list. Further, in states with textbook adoption policies, there seems to be a weaker correlation between one's willingness to use an innovation and its adoption by one's school than in states without such a policy. Further studies are needed to determine if state textbook adoption policies are barriers to the diffusion of social studies innovations.

Because potential adopters' willingness to adopt innovations is influenced by whether there are observable increases in student interest and learning and whether the innovation meets their needs and is compatible with their values, developers and change agents should make objectives and evaluation data readily available to potential adopters. Change agents and developers should demonstrate to potential adopters how they can minimize costs, risks, and the complexity of using an innovation if they want potential adopters to develop favorable attitudes toward the innovation.

Although there were correlations between perceptions and willingness to adopt, there was little or no correlation between perceptions and adoption, and the correlations between willingness and adoption were weak. This indicates that further study is needed to determine what are the most important factors in determining adoption of educational innovations. In a study of programs for the gifted in Illinois, House et al. (1970) concluded that situational constraints in the local schools prevented teachers from adopting innovations that they liked. Further studies are needed to determine why potential adopters of social studies innovations continue to use materials they do not like and do not use materials that they do like.

References

Hahn, Carole L. "Perceptions of New Social Studies Projects and Their Adoption in Four States. Paper presented to the College and University Faculty at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1974a. ED 098 141.

_____. "Relationships Between Potential Adopters' Perceptions of 'New Social Studies' Materials and Their Adoption of Those Materials." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1974b.

House, E.R., J.M. Steele, and T. Kerin. *Development of Educational Programs: Advocacy in a Non-Rational System.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1970.

Rogers, Everett M., and F. Floyd Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach.* New York, NY: Free Press, 1971.

Chapter 3

DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT MATERIALS

by

Thomas J. Switzer
Malcolm A. Lowther
William M. Hanna
Ralph D. Kidder

The University of Michigan

This article is adapted from a paper presented at the November 1974 meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Chicago.

Perhaps no field of education has changed more in recent years than has the social studies. In the last ten to 15 years there have been considerable changes in attitudes about what should constitute social studies and important developments in teaching strategies designed to bring about desired outcomes.

Much, but not all, of the efforts to change the social studies have been channeled through curriculum materials developed by national projects. Literally millions of public and private dollars have been spent on the assumption that the social studies could be changed if teachers would use new curriculum materials in their classrooms.

These efforts to change the social studies have generated considerable debate about the use and effectiveness of project materials. However, little research exists on either of these important issues. One illustration of such research is the work done by Guenther and Dumas (1973) in which they found in 1971 that only a small percentage of the social studies teachers in Kansas and Missouri were familiar with and/or using new project materials in social studies.

The study reported here dealt with the extent to which secondary school social studies teachers in five Midwestern states had heard of and were using curricular materials developed by ten nationally recognized social studies curriculum projects. Specifically it sought answers to the following questions:

1) To what extent have secondary school social studies teachers heard of the project materials in social studies?
2) Through what sources have teachers heard of the project materials?
3) To what extent have secondary school social studies teachers examined the project materials?
4) To what extent have social studies teachers been instructed in the use of the project materials?
5) To what extent and in what courses are social studies teachers using project materials?
6) What variables are related significantly to social studies teachers hearing about, examining, and using project materials?

Procedure

Using lists of the public high schools in the states of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, the total number of secondary schools in the five states were determined. Each state's proportion of the total number of schools was then calculated and on the basis of this proportion a total of 100 schools was selected for the study: 13 in Indiana, 15 in Wisconsin, 22 in Michigan, 24 in Illinois, and 26 in Ohio. The schools within each of the subsamples were selected by means of a table of random numbers. Schools were selected as the sampling unit instead of teachers due to our inability to secure lists of social studies teachers for the states surveyed.

Data about teachers were obtained by means of a survey questionnaire developed by the researchers. The first section of the questionnaire contained 13 demographic items such as age, sex, undergraduate academic major, National Council for the Social Studies membership, courses taught, and so on. In the second section participants were asked to respond to an identical set of questions for each of ten nationally recognized curriculum projects in social studies: Amherst Project, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project (ACSP), University of California at Berkeley Asian Studies Program, Carnegie-Mellon University Social Studies Project, Harvard Social Studies Project's *Public Issues Series*, High School Geography Project (HSGP), Indiana University's *American Political Behavior*, Law in American Society Foundation's *Justice in Urban America Series*, San Jose State's *Economics in Society*, and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (SRSS). For each project there was a brief description of it, a description of the materials developed, and a publisher listing. Each description was followed by nine questions dealing with various aspects of knowledge about and use of the project's material.

Seven hundred questionnaires were mailed to the principals of the 100 schools in the sample. Each principal also received a letter explaining the nature of the project and requesting cooperation in both distributing the questionnaire to social studies teachers and in completing a form specifying the actual number of questionnaires distributed.

Three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to all the principals and two weeks after that telephone calls were placed to the principals of those schools from which no response had been received.

It is difficult to determine the actual response rate in this study. Two hundred sixty-three of the 700 questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 37.6 percent; of these, 252 were usable. However, few of the principals returned the forms specifying the number of questionnaires distributed to their teachers, so we lack evidence as to the number of questionnaires actually distributed. Further, the number of questionnaires sent to a particular school was based on an estimate of the number of social studies teachers necessary to staff a school with a particular size of student population. In every case, one more questionnaire was sent than was anticipated would be needed. For those schools where the principal did respond with the number of questionnaires distributed, we generally overestimated by at least one or two questionnaires. All of this leads us to believe that the actual response rate was considerably higher than 37.6 percent and that it may have been over 50 percent.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Before reviewing the findings, it is interesting to note some of the characteristics of the respondents. Of the 252 respondents who could be coded, 33.1 percent came from Michigan, 21.5 percent from Ohio, 19.5 percent from Illinois, 13.5 percent from Indiana, and 12.4 percent from Wisconsin. Males made up 77 percent of the respondents. Over half of the respondents (58.4 percent) taught in small towns and rural settings. However, 56.3 percent taught in schools with a graduating class of 300 or more.

Respondents with ten or more years of teaching experience made up 51.8 percent of the total, and 71.5 percent had taught four or more years in their present schools; 89.3 percent classified themselves as teachers, with the remaining 10.7 percent identifying themselves as department heads; 53.2 percent wanted to continue as social studies teachers, with 35.1 percent wanting to be upwardly mobile within education; 82 percent did not belong to the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS).

History majors made up 43.7 percent of the respondents and 34.5 percent listed a general social studies degree program. Very few had majored in social science disciplines such as anthropology, geography, and sociology. The majority of the respondents (58.2 percent) had a master's degree or higher.

Results

Heard of Materials

Table 1 reports the number of projects that had been heard of by the respondents. Inspection of the data reveals that 13.1 percent of the

Table 1

Projects Heard of by Total Respondents		
Number of Projects Heard of	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total
0	33	13.1
1	36	14.3
2	44	17.5
3	29	11.5
4	21	8.3
5	16	6.3
6	27	10.7
7	16	6.3
8	17	6.7
9	9	3.6
10	4	1.6

respondents had heard of none of the projects, 14.3 percent of one project, 17.5 percent of two projects, and so on. It is instructive to note that 56.4 percent of the respondents had heard of three or fewer of the national projects.

Data in Table 2 reveal that only the Carnegie-Mellon Project had been heard of by more than 50 percent of the respondents. Almost reaching

Table 2

Heard of Project Material by State and Total Respondents												
	State											
	Michigan		Ohio		Wisconsin		Illinois		Indiana		Total	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	33	40.7	11	21.2	16	51.6	28	57.1	16	47.1	104	41.9
ACSP	33	40.2	7	13.0	8	25.8	16	33.3	10	30.3	74	29.7
Berkeley	17	20.5	14	26.4	9	31.0	18	36.7	8	24.2	66	26.6
Carnegie	45	54.9	27	50.0	21	67.7	30	61.2	21	61.8	145*	57.8
Harvard	39	47.6	19	35.8	18	60.0	21	43.8	12	36.4	109	44.1
HSGP	27	32.5	7	13.2	10	32.3	17	34.7	12	35.3	73	29.1
Indiana	34	41.5	23	43.4	9	29.0	19	38.8	20	58.8	105	42.0
Law in Am. Society	49	59.8	20	37.7	16	51.6	27	55.1	12	35.3	124	49.6
San Jose	6	7.2	2	3.7	7	22.6	12	24.5	4	11.8	31	12.3
SRSS	22	27.2	9	16.7	12	38.7	17	34.7	14	41.2	75*	30.0

*Total "heard of" respondents does not equal state totals combined due to state totals not including one respondent who could not be identified by state.

the 50 percent "heard of" level was the Law in American Society Project (49.6 percent), followed by the Harvard Project (44.1 percent), the Indiana Project (42.0 percent) and the Amherst Project (41.9 percent). Three behavioral science projects funded by the National Science Foundation--Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, High School Geography Project, and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies--all came in at around the 30 percent "heard of" level. Also of interest is the consistency among the various states, with the possible exception of Ohio, where the percentages hearing of the projects were somewhat lower than in the other states.

Table 3 on the next page suggests why certain projects have been heard of more than others. First, it is clear that respondents teaching

Table 3

Heard of Project Material by Subject Taught																		
	Subject Taught																	
	U.S. History N=135		Political Science N=91		Geography N=27		Sociology N=33		Psychology N=28		Economics N=36		World History N=62		Anthro-pology N=14		Other N=77	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	63	46.7	42	46.2	9	33.3	14	42.4	8	28.6	22	61.1	20	32.3	7	50.0	32	41.6
ACSP	37	27.4	30	33.0	10	37.0	10	30.3	9	32.1	13	36.1	16	25.8	13	92.9	20	26.0
Berkeley	34	25.2	25	27.3	8	29.6	7	21.2	5	17.9	11	30.6	15	24.2	6	42.9	20	26.0
Carnegie	73	54.1	64	70.3	18	66.7	17	51.5	13	46.4	28	77.8	32	51.6	10	71.4	46	59.7
Harvard	61	45.2	41	45.1	14	52.0	15	45.5	10	35.7	17	47.2	27	43.5	9	64.3	32	41.6
HSGP	39	28.9	25	27.5	20	74.1	9	27.3	5	17.9	13	36.1	13	21.0	8	57.1	19	24.7
Indiana	55	40.7	53	58.2	11	40.7	13	39.4	12	42.9	19	52.8	22	35.5	9	64.3	30	39.0
Law in Am. Society	64	47.4	54	59.3	12	44.4	15	45.5	13	46.4	18	50.0	25	40.3	11	78.6	38	49.4
San Jose	17	12.6	14	15.4	5	18.5	4	12.1	3	10.7	16	44.4	5	8.1	3	21.4	10	13.0
SRSS	35	25.9	28	30.8	10	37.0	23	69.7	10	35.7	19	52.8	15	24.2	6	42.9	26	33.8

subject matter dealt with by a particular project are more likely to have heard of it than they are to have heard of one with subject matter they do not teach. For example, 92.9 percent of those teaching anthropology had heard of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, 74.1 percent of those teaching geography had heard of the High School Geography Project, 69.7 percent of those teaching sociology had heard of Sociological Resources, and so on.

But it is noteworthy that projects such as Carnegie-Mellon and Harvard, which produced materials in several discipline areas or materials that can be used equally well in several subject areas, have a relatively high percentage having heard of the materials regardless of subject taught. Projects focusing more specifically on a single discipline find their popularity somewhat limited to those respondents teaching that particular subject. In some cases this may be a function of the title of the project or of teacher perception of what the project deals with and not a function of the actual nature of the materials. A case in point may be Sociological Resources, which produced a series of "episodes" for use in courses other than sociology, including history courses. Yet only 25.9 percent of the U.S. history teachers and 24.2 percent of those teaching world history had heard of these materials.

Examined Materials

In considering the number of respondents who had actually examined project materials, Table 4 on the next page reveals that 21.8 percent had examined none of the projects and that an additional 22.6 percent had examined only one project. A total of 74.5 percent had examined three or fewer projects and only 0.8 percent (two individuals) had examined nine or ten projects.

Data reported in Table 5 on page 39 reveal the expected fall-off from the "heard of" level. For example, 42.2 percent of the respondents had examined the Carnegie-Mellon materials, a fall-off of 15.6 percent from the "heard of" percentage of 57.8; 36.4 percent had examined Law in American Society materials, down 13.2 percent from the "heard of" percentage; and 35.2 percent had examined the Harvard materials, down 8.9 percent from the "heard of" level. All other percentages at the

Table 4

Projects Examined by Total Respondents		
Number of Projects Examined	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total
0	55	21.8
1	57	22.8
2	48	19.0
3	28	11.1
4	23	9.1
5	13	5.2
6	13	5.2
7	6	2.4
8	7	2.8
9	1	.4
10	1	.4

"examined" level were below 30 percent, with the bottom being anchored by the San Jose project, where only six percent of the respondents had examined the materials. The project suffering the greatest fall-off from the "heard of" to the "examined" level was the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, which dropped 16.4 percentage points. The Carnegie, Harvard, and Law in American Society projects maintained their relatively high percentages across all five states surveyed.

Inspection of Table 6 on page 40 reveals the same pattern as the previous "subject taught" breakdowns (Table 3): teachers are more inclined to examine project materials if they deal with the subject they are teaching. For example, 78.6 percent of the anthropology teachers had examined Anthropology Curriculum Study Project materials and 63 percent of the geography teachers had looked at the High School Geography Project. But, like the situation at the "heard of" level, few teachers had examined curriculum materials outside of their teaching area, in spite of the fact that some of these materials would be useful in their classes.

Table 5

Examined Project Material by State and Total Respondents												
	State											
	Michigan N=83		Ohio N=54		Wisconsin N=31		Illinois N=49		Indiana N=34		Total*	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	20	24.1	4	7.4	11	35.5	17	34.7	12	35.3	64	25.8
ACSP	17	20.5	1	1.9	3	9.7	6	12.2	6	17.6	33	13.3
Berkeley	7	8.4	3	5.6	5	16.1	9	18.4	7	20.6	31	12.5
Carnegie	32	38.6	19	35.2	15	48.4	22	44.9	17	50.0	106**	42.2
Harvard	30	36.1	14	25.9	14	45.2	18	36.7	11	45.8	87	35.2
HSGP	17	20.5	4	7.4	6	19.4	11	22.4	8	23.5	46	18.3
Indiana	22	26.5	16	29.6	5	16.1	12	24.5	17	50.0	72	28.8
Law in Am. Society	36	43.4	10	18.5	14	45.2	21	42.9	10	29.4	91	36.4
San Jose	3	3.6	1	1.9	4	12.9	5	10.2	2	5.9	15	6.0
SRSS	8	9.6	5	9.3	7	22.6	11	22.4	13	38.2	44	17.6

* Percents are based on total numbers of respondents on each project.

**Total "have examined" respondents does not equal state totals combined since one respondent could not be classified by state.

Use of Project Materials

Table 7 on page 41 deals with the number of projects that the respondents reported using in their classrooms. As might be anticipated from previous data, almost 50 percent of the respondents reported using none of the project materials. Combining the first three categories reveals that 90.1 percent of the respondents reported using two or fewer of the projects.

Evidence reported in Table 8 on page 41 reveals that the Harvard materials were the most popular, with 20.2 percent of the respondents reporting using the materials. This finding is interesting since, at the

Table 6

Examined Project Material, by Subject Taught																		
	Subject Taught																	
	U.S. History N=135		Political Science N=91		Geography N=27		Sociology N=33		Psychology N=28		Economics N=36		World History N=62		Anthro-pology N=14		Other N=77	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	35	35.9	28	30.8	8	30.0	6	18.2	8	28.6	13	36.1	9	14.5	3	21.4	19	24.7
ASCP	16	11.9	12	13.2	6	22.2	4	12.1	4	14.3	4	11.1	7	11.3	11	78.6	11	14.3
Berkeley	16	11.9	10	11.0	4	14.8	4	12.1	1	3.6	6	16.7	9	14.5	5	35.7	10	13.0
Carnegie	59	43.7	41	45.1	13	48.1	13	39.4	9	32.1	8	22.2	24	38.7	8	57.1	36	46.8
Harvard	50	37.0	34	37.4	9	33.3	12	36.4	6	21.4	12	33.3	21	33.9	8	57.1	25	32.5
HSGP	23	17.0	15	16.5	17	63.0	5	15.2	3	10.7	7	19.4	6	9.7	5	35.7	12	15.6
Indiana	39	28.9	39	42.9	8	29.6	6	18.2	9	32.1	10	27.8	12	19.4	8	57.1	20	26.0
Law in Am. Society	48	35.6	40	44.0	9	33.3	10	30.3	10	35.7	13	36.1	14	22.6	11	78.6	30	39.0
San Jose	8	5.9	8	8.8	3	11.1	0	0	1	3.6	8	22.2	1	1.6	2	14.3	5	6.5
SRSS	16	11.9	14	15.4	8	29.6	18	54.5	7	25.0	7	19.4	8	12.9	3	21.4	17	22.1

Table 7

Projects Used by Total Respondents		
Number of Projects Used	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total
0	125	49.6
1	70	27.8
2	32	12.7
3	11	4.4
4	7	2.8
5	5	2.0
6	2	.8

Table 8

Use of Project Material by State and Total Respondents

	State											
	Michigan N=83		Ohio N=54		Wisconsin N=31		Illinois N-49		Indiana N-34		Total*	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	5	6.0	1	1.9	2	6.5	3	6.1	3	8.8	14	5.6
ACSP	10	12.0	0	0	1	3.2	2	4.1	1	2.9	14	5.6
Berkeley	1	1.2	0	0	1	3.2	1	2.0	0	0	3	1.2
Carnegie	17	20.5	7	13.0	6	19.4	9	18.4	8	23.5	47	18.7
Harvard	18	21.7	7	13.0	8	25.8	10	20.4	7	20.6	50	20.2
HSGP	4	4.8	1	1.9	2	6.5	5	10.2	1	2.9	13	5.2
Indiana	12	14.5	3	5.6	1	3.2	4	8.2	6	17.6	26	10.4
Law in Am. Society	17	20.5	5	9.3	6	19.4	10	20.4	6	17.6	44	17.6
San Jose	0	0	0	0	2	6.5	2	4.1	0	0	4	1.6
SRSS	3	3.6	3	5.6	4	12.9	3	6.1	4	11.8	17	6.8

*Percents are based on total respondents on each project.

"heard of" and "examined" levels, the Harvard project ranked no better than third behind the Carnegie-Mellon project and the Law in American Society project. At the "used" level, the Carnegie project is ranked second (18.7 percent) with Law in American Society ranking third (17.6 percent). Only one other project produced a use factor of more than 10 percent: the Indiana project, where 10.4 percent reported using the materials. The data in Table 8 are even more dramatic when looked at negatively: 79.8 percent were not using the Harvard materials, 94.4 percent were not using Amherst materials or the ACSP materials, 98.9 percent were not using the Berkeley Asian Studies materials, and so on.

Examination of the use of project material by subject taught (Table 9, on the following page) reveals a similar pattern to that reported at the other levels. The Carnegie and Harvard projects show the highest percentage of use across subject matter taught, while the other projects show a relatively high percentage of use only in the subject area where the project places its primary emphasis. However, only 7.4 percent of those teaching U.S. history were using the Amherst U.S. history units, while 22.2 percent were using Harvard materials and 20.7 percent were using Carnegie-Mellon materials. Unfortunately, at the use level, the number of entries becomes quite small.

Table 10 looks at use of project materials as a percent of total respondents on a particular project, as a percent of those who had heard of the project materials, and as a percent of those who had examined the materials. Note that although only 20.2 percent of the total respondents were using Harvard Project materials, 45.9 percent of those who had heard of them were using the materials and 57.5 percent of those who had examined the materials were using them. Apparently the majority of those who examined the Harvard materials found them of some value in their classrooms.

Second in use among those who had examined the materials was the Law in American Society Project (48.4 percent), followed by the Carnegie-Mellon Project (44.3 percent). One interesting finding is the large increase made by the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project from use as a percent of those who had heard of the materials (18.9 percent) to use as a percent of those who had examined the materials (42.4 percent). One

Table 9

Use of Project Material by Subject Matter Taught																		
	Subject Taught																	
	U.S. History N=135		Political Science N=91		Geography N=27		Sociology N=33		Psychology N=28		Economics N=36		World History N=62		Anthro-pology N=14		Other N=77	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	10	7.4	3	3.3	2	7.4	2	6.1	2	7.1	3	8.3	3	4.8	0	0	4	5.2
ACSP	7	5.2	7	7.7	1	3.7	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	4	6.5	9	64.3	5	6.5
Berkeley	2	1.5	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	1	1.6	1	7.1	3	3.9
Carnegie	28	20.7	27	29.7	5	18.5	4	12.1	4	14.3	11	30.6	11	17.7	3	21.4	14	18.2
Harvard	30	22.2	24	26.4	7	25.9	8	24.2	4	14.3	8	22.2	14	22.6	6	42.8	17	22.1
HSGP	5	3.7	4	4.4	9	33.3	3	9.1	0	0	1	2.8	2	3.2	3	21.4	3	3.9
Indiana	10	7.4	22	24.2	2	7.4	1	3.0	2	7.1	3	8.3	3	4.8	4	28.6	9	11.7
Law in Am. Society	19	14.1	27	29.7	4	14.8	8	24.2	3	10.7	5	13.9	3	4.8	2	14.3	16	20.8
San Jose	2	1.5	2	2.2	1	3.7	0	0	1	3.6	4	11.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.3
SRSS	6	4.4	5	5.5	3	11.1	12	36.4	4	14.3	3	8.3	3	4.8	1	7.1	7	9.1

Table 10

Use of Project Material as Percent of Total Respondents, as Percent of "Heard Of," and as Percent of "Examined"			
Project	As Percent of Total	As Percent of "Heard Of"	As Percent of "Examined"
Amherst N=248	5.6	13.5	21.9
ACSP N=249	5.6	18.9	42.4
Berkeley N=248	1.2	4.5	9.7
Carnegie N=251	18.7	32.4	44.3
Harvard N=247	20.2	45.9	57.5
HSGP N=251	5.2	17.8	28.3
Indiana N=250	10.4	24.8	36.1
Law in Am. Society N=250	17.6	35.5	48.4
San Jose N=252	1.6	12.9	26.7
SRSS N=250	6.8	22.7	38.6

might conclude that those teachers who had gone so far as to examine the anthropology materials found them usable in their classrooms. However, it might be that only those teachers actually teaching anthropology examined the materials and that they were the ones most likely to use them.

Instruction in Use of Materials

As might be expected, few of the respondents had received instruction in the use of project materials. Data in Table 11 reveal that 71 percent

Table 11

Respondents Receiving Instruction in Any Project		
Number of Projects Instructed	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total
0	179	71.0
1	49	19.4
2	12	4.8
3	5	2.0
4	4	1.6
5	0	0
6	2	.8
7	0	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	1	.4

had received no instruction in the use of the materials, 19.4 percent had received instruction in only one project, and so on. Instruction was not defined in the questionnaire, so that the nature of the instruction reported probably covers the range from college courses to institutes to one-day workshops.

In only one case, the Carnegie-Mellon materials, did as many as ten percent of the total respondents report receiving instruction in the use of the materials. (See Table 12 on following page.) However, when those who reported receiving instruction are taken as a percentage of those who had heard of the material, considerable increases occur, with the Indiana Project taking the lead. One might conclude from these data that relatively more attention has been given to providing instruction by the Indiana Project, Sociological Resources, the High School Geography

Table 12

Respondents Receiving Instruction in Specific Projects		
Project	Percent of Total Respondents	Percent of Those Who Had Heard of Material
Amherst	4	9.6
ACSP	4.8	16.2
Berkeley	.08	3.0
Carnegie	10.0	17.2
Harvard	5.3	11.9
HSGP	5.2	17.8
Indiana	8.8	21.0
Law in Am. Society	2.8	5.6
San Jose	1.6	12.9
SRSS	5.6	18.7

Project, the Carnegie-Mellon Project, and Anthropology Curriculum Study Project than has been given by the other projects, particularly the Harvard Project and the Law in American Society Project, in spite of their popularity and use.

Sources of First Hearing

Tables 13 and 14 present information on the sources through which respondents first heard of project materials. The data in Table 13 show that professional publications were the most frequent source of first hearing (25.2 percent), followed by friend or colleague (23.7 percent). Thus the two most frequent sources of first hearing are a formal means (professional publication) and an informal means (friend and colleague).

The low percentage of respondents listing the publisher as a source of first hearing is explained by the fact that "publisher" was not one of the options listed on the questionnaire. However, the number of respondents listing this source under the questionnaire category "other" suggests that it deserved coding and special listing. Had "publisher" been a listed option, in all probability it would have been checked by more respondents.

Table 13

Source of First Hearing of Project Material		
Source	Number	Percent*
Professional Publication	228	25.2
Project Newsletter	82	9.1
College Course	106	11.7
Professional Meeting	159	17.5
Institute or Workshop	105	11.6
Friend or Colleague	215	23.7
Publisher	54	6.0
Other	73	8.1

*Percentages do not total to 100 due to respondents listing more than one source of first hearing.

Table 14, on the next page, reveals the source of first hearing by project. These data confirm the findings from Table 13 that professional publications, friends or colleagues, and professional meetings tend to be important sources for first hearing about project materials.

Demographic Variables

Analysis of the relationship of the demographic variables to knowledge and use of project materials was disappointing in that only two variables produced significant relationships. For nine of the ten projects, social studies department chairpersons and members of NCSS were significantly more likely (at the .05 level) to have heard of the materials than were full-time social studies teachers and non-NCSS members respectively. Other demographic variables examined were years teaching experience, years in present school, number of school systems taught in, position desired five years from now, sex, age, undergraduate major, highest degree, school location, and size of graduating class. For these there were no patterns to indicate that any of them were significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials.

Table 14

Source of First Hearing by Project																
	Source															
	Professional Publications		Project Newsletter		College Course		Professional Meeting		Institute or Workshop		Friend or Colleague		Publisher		Other	
Project	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Amherst	24	23.1	8	7.7	19	18.3	19	18.3	12	11.5	28	26.9	4	3.8	6	5.8
ACSP	17	23.0	8	10.8	5	6.8	13	17.6	7	9.5	16	21.6	7	9.5	8	10.8
Berkeley	25	37.9	4	6.1	8	12.1	11	16.7	5	7.6	8	12.1	3	4.5	3	4.5
Carnegie	37	23.4	7	4.8	27	18.6	25	17.2	24	16.6	31	21.4	5	3.4	15	10.3
Harvard	28	25.7	12	11.0	15	13.8	18	16.5	11	10.1	25	22.9	6	5.5	9	8.3
HSGP	15	20.5	11	15.1	12	16.4	17	23.3	9	12.3	21	28.8	4	5.5	2	2.7
Indiana	22	21.0	10	9.5	8	7.6	22	21.0	17	16.2	24	22.9	6	5.7	8	7.6
Law in Am. Society	29	23.4	10	8.1	4	3.2	16	12.9	9	7.3	37	29.8	14	11.3	13	10.5
San Jose	11	35.5	3	9.8	2	6.5	4	12.9	4	12.9	6	19.4	0	0	3	9.7
SRSS	20	26.7	9	12.0	6	8.0	14	18.7	7	9.3	19	25.3	5	6.7	6	8.0

The relationship of NCSS membership to knowledge and use of project materials deserves special mention (see Table 15). It is not surprising

Table 15

Relationship of Hearing of Project Material to Membership in the National Council for the Social Studies				
Project	x^2	df	P*	C
Amherst	14.0	1	<.0003	.23
ACSP	13.3	1	<.0004	.23
Berkeley	14.3	1	<.0003	.23
Carnegie	10.7	1	<.002	.20
Harvard	5.4	1	<.03	.15
HSGP	8.4	1	<.004	.18
Indiana	9.7	1	<.002	.19
Law in Am. Soc.	8.9	1	<.005	.18
San Jose	.50	1	NS	.04
SRSS	16.8	1	<.0001	.25

*With the exception of the San Jose Project, all of the relationships are positive: respondents who were members of NCSS were significantly more likely to have heard of the various national projects than were those respondents who were not NCSS Members.

that NCSS members were more likely to have heard of project materials than were non-NCSS members. Given the finding that professional publications are a major source of first hearing and given that *Social Education* has made a concerted effort to bring information about the projects to its readers, we would indeed be surprised if NCSS members had not heard of the project materials. In fact, we do have some evidence from this study that NCSS members do use more formal means of hearing about new developments than do non-NCSS members. For six of the ten projects there was a significant positive relationship between NCSS membership and hearing about the project materials through professional publications. Three of the other projects produced data that lean in this direction, with only the Amherst Project showing NCSS members and non-members just as likely to hear of the project through professional publications.

Further, four of the ten projects show a significant negative relationship between NCSS membership and hearing about the project through a friend or colleague. NCSS members were less likely to hear about the projects through a friend or colleague than were non-NCSS members. The other projects, although not showing a significant relationship on these variables, produced data that lean in the direction of non-NCSS members' using more informal means of communication than NCSS members. Unfortunately, 82 percent of the respondents in this study were not NCSS members.

However, a surprising finding is reported in Table 16--NCSS members who had heard of project materials were no more likely to go on to examine the materials than were non-NCSS members who had heard of the materials.

Table 16

Relationship of Examination of Project Material to Membership in the National Council for the Social Studies				
Project	X^2	df	P*	C
Amherst	.43	1	<.52	.06
ACSP	.16	1	<.70	.05
Berkeley	.33	1	<.86	.02
Carnegie	2.12	1	<.15	.12
Harvard	.49	1	<.49	.07
HSGP	.12	1	<.92	.01
Indiana	.41	1	<.53	.06
Law in Am. Soc.	2.12	1	<.15	.13
San Jose	1.92	1	<.17	.24
SRSS	.67	1	<.80	.03

*The significance levels reported in this table do not reach the 0.05 level of confidence which was required throughout the study to denote significance. The data are presented to show that NCSS members who had heard of project materials were no more likely to examine the materials than were non-NCSS members who had heard of the materials.

Apparently, those non-NCSS members who had heard of the project materials share some characteristic with NCSS members who had heard of the materials that leads them to the next step, an examination of the materials. And

although the data are not displayed here, NCSS membership was also not a significant factor in the actual use of the project materials. This does not mean, of course, that NCSS membership has no bearing on the eventual use of project materials, for it obviously is an important factor in first hearing about the materials. But it should be remembered that NCSS membership in and of itself did not lead a person to examination and use of project materials.

Discussion

Now, what do we make of all these data? From one perspective, it is discouraging to find that 70 percent of the respondents had never heard of SRSS, HSGP, and ACSP and that only the Carnegie project had been heard of by more than 50 percent of the respondents. And if one considers the millions of dollars spent on developing these project materials, it is disheartening to see that for seven of the ten projects more than 90 percent of the respondents were not using the materials, and that for the most widely used project (Harvard) virtually 80 percent reported they were not using the materials. Another upsetting finding is that so few teachers had received instruction in the use of the project materials and especially so for those projects receiving relatively high use.

However, from another perspective the data look encouraging. Almost all the anthropology teachers had heard of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project and 64 percent reported using the materials. Of the geography teachers, 74 percent had heard of HSGP and over 33 percent reported using the materials. Similarly 24.2 percent of the political science teachers were using *American Political Behavior* and almost 30 percent of them were using the *Justice in Urban America Series*. And 36 percent of the sociology teachers were using SRSS materials. Given the abundance of materials available for classroom use, given the constant battle that project materials face with more traditional materials, and given the slowness of change in education, perhaps we should be pleased with the level of use of project materials.

This is not to say, of course, that we can not improve our methods of communication or that we do not need to increase our efforts at inservice

education. Indeed, a large potential market for the project materials does not even know the materials exist. But given the popularity of project materials among those teaching the appropriate subjects, and given that the materials have served as prototypes for other materials, perhaps all our time, money, and effort have not been wasted. One would certainly hope not.

References

Guenther, John, and Wayne Dumas. "Teacher Familiarity With and Use of Project Social Studies Materials in the Midwest." *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 30, No. 7 (April 1973) pp. 641-43.

Chapter 4

UTILIZATION OF "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

by

Mary Jane Turner
and
Frances Haley
Social Science Education Consortium

with the assistance of

Donald English and John Timmons

Originally published jointly by the Social Science Education Consortium and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education in 1975 under the same title (SSEC Publication No. 178; ED 102 038).

The material in this chapter was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Council for the Social Studies for critical review and determination of professional competence. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Council for the Social Studies or the National Institute of Education.

During the 1960s designers of social studies curriculum materials created a vast array of instructional packages. While the personnel of each project approached their task with different goals and educational philosophies, a basic concern for quality education guided them all. Millions of dollars were funneled into social studies curriculum development projects by the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and various other agencies and groups.

The curriculum materials that emerged from these projects are popularly referred to as the "new social studies." They differ markedly in their design and in the nature of their intended use. Some of the programs are multigrade, multimedia presentations. Others provide basic textbook materials for a specific course. There are one-semester programs and programs that are primarily supplementary.

The materials first became available from publishers in the mid-1960s, and some of the earlier materials have already been revised. Yet little has been done to assess the impact of the large expenditure of time, money, and expertise that was involved in developing the programs. Little is known about the extent to which teachers are using these

---

The task of collecting data about the extent of use of particular curricula is not an easy one. Principals in every school from which information was received facilitated the task by distributing the questionnaires to their social studies teachers and by urging the teachers to respond. In some instances, school district policy required the approval of superintendents. This approval was generally forthcoming. Social studies teachers, themselves, showed great tolerance and patience by taking the time to read and respond to our rather lengthy questionnaires. The help and cooperation of all of these people is greatly appreciated.

Before the project could even begin, decisions had to be made about which states should be surveyed, what grade levels should be examined, and what questions should be asked. Irving Morrissett (SSEC), Jack Cousins (University of Colorado), and John D. Haas (University of Colorado) offered helpful advice and direction. Robert V. Stover (University of Colorado) served as consultant to the project and guided the quantification and evaluation of data.

Also consulted were Thomas J. Switzer (University of Michigan), Carole L. Hahn (Emory University), and John Guenther (University of Kansas), who made their own studies and insights available to us. Sharryl Hawke edited the manuscript and greatly improved its readability.

Thanks are also due to Carol Rayburn, Patricia Cox, Chad Eckdahl, Frankie Sternberg, and Cindy Ellis, who tabulated data, surely one of the more thankless tasks in research. Finally, the authors appreciate the usual good typing and production job done by Nancy Dille and Cindy Ellis.

materials. Less is understood about why teachers choose, or do not choose, to use the products. There is scant evidence from teachers using the materials about their effectiveness in the classroom.

This study was designed to investigate and report on the extent of utilization of nine sets of new social studies materials in four states: California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Texas. Also reported are data concerning characteristics of the teachers using these materials and information on teachers' perceptions of success in using the nine programs.

The Problem

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this report is to present and analyze data about

1) the extent of use of nine major social studies programs;
2) the characteristics of users of these nine programs; and
3) the perceptions of users about how effective the materials are and how the products compare with other social studies materials.

This study was undertaken because little empirical evidence has been collected about the utilization of "new social studies" programs and the teachers who use the materials.

There have been some studies which explore the problem of change in social studies education generally, but few studies have looked specifically at adoption of curriculum materials. The exceptions are studies by Guenther and Dumas (1971), Hahn (1973), Bragaw (1974), and Switzer (1974), which are described in the Review of the Literature which follows in the next section of this paper.

Despite the lack of data about the utilization of new materials, at least one study indicates that adoption of specific curriculum materials is an important element of change in schools. In a study of 7,237 accredited high schools, Cawelti (1967) determined that curriculum change appears to be more easily diffused than other, more costly changes. Because the adoption of curriculum materials may be an important determinant of improvement in social studies education, it seems relevant to ask not only how frequently new social studies materials are used but

related questions such as: Are there consistent similarities or differences in the patterns of use by states? Does use relate to the size or location of schools? Does the location of the school (urban, rural) affect the use of materials?

In studies which have examined the use of materials in classrooms, the primary focus has been on the programs themselves rather than on the characteristics of individual users of the programs. If behavior was studied at all, it was considered in terms of the interaction between the influenced and the influencer. While such a focus is important, it is also meaningful to examine the characteristics of the teachers who use new materials. Factors such as the user's age, years of teaching experience, professional status, and teaching contract terms may well be important in the utilization of new materials.

Little research has been reported on teachers' perceptions about use of new social studies materials in the classroom. The Curriculum Information Network (Morrissett 1973) is gathering information from teachers about materials through a twice-yearly questionnaire survey of several hundred volunteer teachers. Teachers are asked how materials worked in the classroom, how they compare with other materials, and whether users would recommend them to other teachers. In general, the new social studies materials were rated higher than other materials. The results also showed relative ratings of about two dozen curriculum packages. This study is designed to present additional data to supplement what has been reported by Morrissett.

Scope of the Study

The research reported in this paper was designed to determine the extent of utilization of nine secondary social studies curriculum materials. The materials are *American Political Behavior*, published by Ginn and Company; *Asian Studies Inquiry Series*, published by Field Educational Publications; *Episodes in Social Inquiry Series*, published by Allyn and Bacon, Inc.; *Geography in an Urban Age*, published by The Macmillan Company; *Holt Social Studies Curriculum*, published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.; *Justice in Urban America*, published

by Houghton-Mifflin Company; *Patterns in Human History*, published by The Macmillan Company; *Public Issues Series*, published by American Education Publications; and *Units in American History*, published by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Three major considerations were made in selecting the curriculum materials used in the study. First, materials had to be products of curriculum development activities sponsored either by the U.S. Office of Education or by the National Science Foundation. Second, the materials had to be published and widely available to educators. Third, a curriculum package relating to each social studies subject area was selected.

The study does not deal directly with the question of what constitutes innovation. It has been assumed that the materials selected for study are innovative in some important senses because they are relatively new and noticeably different in the content and processes employed.

Because a sampling of users in all 50 states was not feasible for this study, the sampling was limited to four states: California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Texas. These four states were chosen for the variety they represented. The states are geographically diverse. The population size and concentrations of the states are different: California has a large, fairly impacted population, Connecticut is highly impacted, Colorado and Texas both have large rural populations along with some urban centers. Textbook adoption procedures in the states also varied, with Texas having state adoption of both elementary and secondary books, California having elementary adoption, and Colorado and Connecticut having no state adoption systems.

Review of the Literature

The literature reviewed here was selected because it bears a special relevance to the concerns of this study. Four general survey studies completed in the past 15 years provide a comprehensive examination of the literature and research done in the field of innovation and diffusion. Everett M. Rogers and his associates conducted an extensive review of the literature on diffusion of products and practices and attempted to standardize terminology dealing with the diffusion process (Rogers 1962; Rogers and Shoemaker 1971). Havelock (1971) also surveyed the literature and designed a framework for understanding the processes of innovation and knowledge utilization, research findings from social psychology on group and organizational behavior and influence processes, and strategies for diffusion.

A third study by Jwaideh and Marker (1973) reviewed dissemination and utilization literature from all fields, then focused on change in social studies education. The authors also described some of the barriers to change in social studies education and outlined strategies and techniques that might be used to bring about diffusion and adoption of the new social studies. Miles (1964) compiled a reference volume which is not directed specifically to educators but is of interest because it includes studies about innovation in many organizational systems.

The remaining studies reported here deal with three specific concerns--utilization of new ideas and materials, characteristics of innovators, and teacher perceptions about innovative materials.

Utilization of New Ideas and Materials

Much of the research on diffusion of ideas has been done in the fields or agriculture, sociology, medicine, anthropology, business, bureaucracy, and education. A major portion of the research has been in rural sociology, where 286 studies were conducted from 1938 to 1962 (Miles 1973).

Most utilization studies have dealt with (1) characteristics of the innovations which are adopted; (2) distribution of adopted innovations over time; (3) perceptions which are held about innovations and their

effects on rates of adoption; (4) functions of opinion leadership in the diffusion process; (5) channels of communication; (6) cultural diffusion and relative successes of change agents; (7) innovation in industry; and (8) characteristics of school innovation (Jwaideh and Marker 1973).

From 1958 to 1962, faculty members at Columbia University conducted a study of diffusion in education. The majority of the data was gathered through questionnaires sent to school superintendents and principals. Three major findings in the area of educational diffusion were noted: (1) the best predictor of educational diffusion is cost per pupil; (2) there is a considerable time lag for educational innovation because scientific information about innovations in education is lacking; and (3) there are not enough change agents or economic incentives to facilitate adoption of new educational practices (Rogers 1962, pp. 40-41).

A number of research studies indicate that innovations which are perceived by potential adopters as high in complexity are not likely to be adopted. Studies in agriculture which support this conclusion are those of Suttles (1951), Erasmus (1952), Polgar (1963), Fliegel and Kivlin (1966), Christiansen (1966), and Elliott (1968). Studies in education which support the same conclusion are those of Camaren (1966), Richburg (1969), and Brennan (1971).

If innovations are perceived by potential adopters as difficult to understand or use or as requiring particular skills or equipment, the likelihood of adoption is lessened (Cawelti 1967). However, if innovations are perceived as easy to observe and try, they are likely to be adopted. The latter conclusion is supported by Sanderson and Kratochvil (1972), whose study dealt with the development and diffusion of the Holt Social Studies Curriculum. In a study of the Developmental Economic Education Program by the American Institute of Research, it was found that the necessity of having a coordinator and committee to develop an action plan for local priorities and needs lessened the acceptance of this program (Kim and Kratochvil 1972, pp. 9-10). Hahn suggests that:

> Research in anthropology, rural sociology, medicine, and education indicated that if potential adopters per-

> ceived innovations to be compatible with their values, felt needs, and previous positive experiences, they were likely to adopt them. The research about relative advantage produced more ambiguous conclusions. On balance, however, it did seem that if innovations were perceived to be low in risk, initial and continuing costs, if they were preceived as yielding immediate rewards, they were likely to be adopted. If potential adopters anticipated greater profits from the innovations than from what they were using previously, they were also more likely to adopt the innovations. It was possible that in education, the anticipation of increased student interest might function as profitability does in business (Hahn 1973, pp. 60-61).

Studies on rates of adoption of innovative ideas in education were first undertaken by Mort and Cornell (1941). They found a three percent adoption rate in 15 years, with a 100-year period projected as necessary for complete diffusion of an innovation. That rate may have accelerated by the 1960s. In five years, 17 percent of the schools had adopted language laboratories, 12 percent had adopted team teaching, and 20 percent had adopted the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC) materials; in eight years, 18 percent had adopted the use of teacher aides (Miles 1964).

Wealthy suburban schools are most innovative, according to Zeigler (1969), who also found that urban centers tend to have the greatest resistance to change, except in times of stress and crisis.

The only research studies dealing with the actual extent of utilization of new social studies materials have been conducted in New York, Kansas, and Missouri. The New York State Department of Education conducted a small survey of New York teachers concerning the materials they were currently using (Bragaw 1974). Guenther and Dumas (1971) conducted a more extensive research project in Kansas and Missouri covering specific usage of several innovative curriculum packages. Research is being conducted currently at the University of Michigan by Thomas Switzer and associates to examine usage of new materials in five states: Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois (Switzer 1974).

Characteristics of Innovators

The literature dealing with innovativeness in education since the beginning of World War II indicates a willingness by researchers to study both personality and background characteristics of teachers.

Barrett (1941) defined the innovator with such terms as frustrated, maladjusted, disgruntled, and incompetent. Mort (1946) indicated that an innovator is often a social reject. Linton (1952) stated that innovators are misfits in their social system, with atypical personalities. Miles (1964) used such terms as agitator, dreamer, and skilled navigator to describe innovators. Leas (1965) compared the innovative teacher with the traditional teacher and discovered that the innovative teacher was younger, had less teaching experience, traveled more, perceived himself as a leader, and was more liberal in social and political beliefs than the traditional teacher. Rogers summarized six general characteristics of innovators, coupling personality and other background characteristics as follows: (1) they are generally young; (2) they have relatively high social status in terms of amount of education, prestige ratings, and income; (3) impersonal and informed sources of information are important to them; (4) they are cosmopolite; (5) they exert opinion leadership; and (6) they are likely to be viewed as deviants by their peers and by themselves (Rogers 1965).

Jwaideh and Marker have rather thoroughly summarized studies of the characteristics of teachers in five adopter categories, as follows:

> A great deal of research has been done on variables related to individual innovativeness....[F]ive adopter categories...have been compared in a number of research studies, and the following salient characteristics of each category have emerged: (1) innovators are characterized by willingness to take risks; (2) early adopters tend to be respected members of their social systems and often serve as role models for peers (opinion leaders are most often in this category); (3) early majority tend to be deliberate and are willing to consider innovations only after their peers adopt; (4) late majority are skeptical and do not adopt until they are pressured to do so by their peers; and (5) laggards tend to be tradition-bound and oriented toward the past (Jwaideh and Marker 1973, pp. 28-29).

Chesler (1966) found that the innovative teacher tended to have more teaching experience than did the non-innovator. Hensel (1969) concluded that the innovator had taught longer and was older than the non-innovator.

An excellent summary of the literature on characteristics of innovators in many organizational systems was compiled by Miles (1973). He reported that:

> From content analysis of research publications in the

Diffusion Document Center at Michigan State University, 3,000 findings relate various independent variables to innovativeness. The research findings on the characteristics of adopter categories are summarized as generalizations under the following headings: socioeconomic status, personality variables, and communication behavior. Some of the generalizations are summarized here:

Socioeconomic Status: (1) Earlier adopters have more years of education than do later adopters. (2) Earlier adopters have higher social status than later adopters. (3) Earlier adopters have a greater degree of social mobility than later adopters. (4) Earlier adopters are younger in age than later adopters. (5) Earlier adopters have a more favorable financial position than later adopters. (6) Earlier adopters have a type of mental ability different from that of later adopters. (7) Earlier adopters are more cosmopolite than later adopters.

Personality Variables: (1) Earlier adopters are less dogmatic than later adopters. (2) Earlier adopters have a greater ability to deal with abstractions than later adopters. (3) Earlier adopters have greater intelligence than later adopters. (4) Earlier adopters have a more favorable attitude toward change than later adopters. (5) Earlier adopters have a more favorable attitude toward education than later adopters. (6) Earlier adopters have higher aspirations than later adopters.

Communication Behavior: (1) Earlier adopters are more highly integrated with the social system than later adopters. (2) Earlier adopters are more cosmopolite than later adopters. (3) Earlier adopters have greater knowledge of innovations than later adopters. (4) Earlier adopters are more likely to belong to systems with modern rather than traditional norms than later adopters. (5) Earlier adopters prefer impersonal sources of information rather than personal sources more so than later adopters. (6) Earlier adopters prefer cosmopolite sources of information more so than later adopters (Miles 1973, pp. 20-22).

Teacher Perceptions about Materials

Very little research has been done concerning teachers' perceptions of the quality and usefulness of materials. One such study is being conducted periodically by the Social Science Education Consortium and the National Council for the Social Studies, with a national volunteer panel of teachers in a Curriculum Information Network (Morrissett 1973, 1975). Teachers are asked how well the materials they use compare with other materials, how well the materials worked with students, and whether they would recommend such materials for use by others.

Methods and Procedures

Development of the Questionnaire

A 15-page questionnaire was designed to gather data on the three research objectives of this study:

1) the extent of use of nine major social studies programs;
2) the characteristics of users of those nine programs; and
3) user perceptions about the effectiveness of the materials and the comparison of the programs with other social studies materials.

To explore the extent and use of the materials, users were asked if they are using the materials and in what course/courses they are using the materials.

The variables explored in studying the characteristics of teachers using materials were the following: age, years of teaching experience, professional organization membership, professional status, status of teaching contract, location of school (urban-inner city, urban-suburban, small town, rural), and size of school.

User perceptions of the materials were determined by questions which asked teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of the materials with the students, to compare the materials with other social studies materials, and to indicate if they would recommend the materials to other teachers.

When the questionnaire was completed, it was informally field tested with visitors to the Resource and Demonstration Center of the Social Science Education Consortium and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. This Center, located in Boulder, Colorado, serves as a resource to social studies teachers and consultants, school administrators, college and university personnel, and others who are interested in the materials and strategies of the new social studies. During the field-test period visitors to the Center were asked to complete one of the questionnaires and to comment on difficulties they had with the design or wording of the questionnaire. Appropriate revisions were made following the test period.

Distribution of the Questionnaires

For distributing the questionnaires lists of social studies teachers were not available, so sampling was done by schools. From a complete list of secondary schools in the four states, 150 schools from each state were chosen by a random process. It was estimated that these 600 schools would include 4,000 or more social studies teachers.

Questionnaires were sent to the principals of the sample schools with cover letters asking them to distribute the questionnaires to their social studies teachers. One questionnaire was sent for each 100 students in a school. As a check on the possible reactions of principals to this request, 60 randomly selected principals in Texas and Colorado were telephoned. All but two of them agreed to distribute the questionnaires to their teachers.

Questionnaires were mailed on May 3, 1974. A total of 4,783 questionnaires were sent as follows: California, 1,392; Colorado, 1,074; Connecticut, 1,574; and Texas, 741. Texas received this small number of questionnaires because so many of its schools have small student populations. Conversely, Connecticut received more questionnaires because the sample schools were larger.

To increase the return of the forms, a follow-up letter was sent in mid-May to all the principals, again urging them to assist in obtaining information. Later in May, another procedure was used to increase the response. Thirty-two principals, who had been surveyed by phone earlier but whose teachers had not returned questionnaires, were again interviewed by telephone.

Nine hundred and eighty questionnaires of the 4,783 mailed were returned, for a percentage return of 20.5. The return by states closely resembles the total return. California returned 288 out of 1,392 questionnaires, or 20.7 percent. Colorado returned 235 out of 1,076, or 21.8 percent. Connecticut returned 277 out of 1,574, or 17.6 percent, and Texas returned 180 out of 741, or 23.2 percent.

While a 20 percent return is not low for a mailed questionnaire, consideration must be given to how this return rate affects the data. Two assumptions were made by the analysts in evaluating the rate of return: (1) Users of materials discussed in the questionnaire were more likely to complete the questionnaire than were non-users. Therefore,

the proportion of users in the sample probably represents an upper limit of the proportion of users in the population sampled. (2) Although the rates of return of users and non-users may be different, valid comparisons can be made about the characteristics of the users and the non-users who did return the questionnaire. However, no generalizations can be drawn about the characteristics of teachers who did not return the questionnaire since no prior information was gathered about the people who received questionnaires.

Compilation of Data

The returned questionnaires required little editing. The responses were coded and punched on cards. Tabulations were completed by use of a card sorter and a computer.

Results--Analyses of Data

Extent of Use of Nine Major Social Studies Programs

The data indicate that of the 980 respondents, 408, or 42 percent, were users of one or more of the nine packages of new social studies materials. The breakdown by states in Table 1 indicates that of the 288 respondents from California, 125 or 43 percent were users. In Colorado, of the 235 respondents, 103 or 44 percent were users; of the 277 Connecticut respondents, 133 or 48 percent were users. Texas data indicate that of the 180 respondents, 47 or 26 percent used one or more of the nine programs. Thus Connecticut, Colorado, and California show similar patterns of use, while Texas deviates substantially from the others.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Users of One or More of Nine New Social Studies Materials, by States

	Number of Respondents	Number of Users	Users as Percent of Respondents
California	288	125	43
Colorado	235	103	44
Connecticut	277	133	48
Texas	180	47	26
Total	980	408	42

The reason for low usage in Texas is that Texas has a state textbook adoption list and only one of the nine packages was on the adoption list at the time of the survey. A state adoption normally does not prohibit the use of non-listed materials but does provide financial incentives which encourage use of adopted materials.

Use of the Nine Sets of Materials, by States. Table 2, on the following page, shows the number and percent of users of each of the nine packages by each state. In reviewing these figures, the reader

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Users of Each of Nine Sets of Materials, by State

	California N = 288		Colorado N = 235		Connecticut N = 277		Texas N = 180		Total N = 980	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
American Political Behavior	34	12	14	6	25	9	21	12	94	10
Asian Studies Inquiry Program	15	5	12	5	11	4	0	0	38	4
Episodes in Social Inquiry	13	5	22	9	16	6	9	5	60	6
Geography in An Urban Age	17	6	26	11	12	4	0	0	55	6
Holt Social Studies Series	48	17	35	15	43	16	12	7	138	14
Justice in Urban America Series	20	9	18	8	25	9	4	2	67	7
Patterns in Human History	7	2	9	4	19	7	1	1	36	4
Public Issues Series	37	13	19	8	44	18	6	3	106	12
Units in American History	11	4	17	7	24	9	4	2	56	6

should remember that the packages differ widely in terms of grade level and scope. For example, the *Holt Social Studies Series* is a curriculum program consisting of seven courses for grades 9 through 12, while *Patterns in Human History* is a 16-week program for use in anthropology courses, with some adaptability for world culture courses. For a complete description of each program, see the individual data sheets in Appendix B.

In the sample, the *Holt Social Studies Series* was clearly the most widely used of the nine programs. Of the 980 respondents, 138 or 14 percent indicated they were using these materials in the classroom. The largest percentage of users of these materials was in California; the smallest in Texas.

The second most frequently used program was the *Public Issues Series*. Twelve percent of the respondents used these materials, with Connecticut teachers using them most frequently and Texas teachers least frequently.

American Political Behavior, the third most frequently used set of materials, was used by 94 or ten percent of the respondents. Of the nine packages, this was the one most frequently used in the state of Texas. The high frequency of use is explained by the fact that *American Political Behavior* is on the Texas textbook adoption list--the only one of the nine sets of materials represented on this list.

Justice in Urban America, with 67 users, *Episodes in Social Inquiry*, with 60 users, and *Units in American History*, with 56 users, ranked fourth, fifth, and sixth respectively in number of users. Connecticut and Colorado had the highest percentage of use of all three programs.

Geography in an Urban Age is ranked seventh in terms of use, with 55 users, or six percent. The use pattern of this program deviates significantly from the other programs. There were no users in Texas, while 11 percent of the respondents from Colorado reported using this program. *Geography in an Urban Age* was developed in Colorado; this may serve to support the conclusion that materials tend to be adopted in those areas where there are individuals who were involved in the development and experimental use of the materials (Geib 1972).

The *Asian Studies Inquiry Program*, with 38 users, and *Patterns in Human History*, with 36 users, rank eighth and ninth in total use by

all respondents.

Use of Appropriate Materials in Specific Subject Area Courses. Perhaps a more significant finding than the total extent of use of the new social studies materials is a determination of how many practitioners are using appropriate materials in specific courses. For instance, it is significant to know how many American government teachers used *American Political Behavior* and how many geography teachers used *Geography in an Urban Age*. The following tables yield that data.

Table 3

	Number Teaching Courses in American Government	Users of *American Political Behavior*	
		No.	%
California	89	22	25
Colorado	50	5	10
Connecticut	62	11	18
Texas	63	17	27
Total	264	55	21

(1) American Government. Table 3 indicates that 264 respondents teach courses in American government. Of this number, 21 percent used *American Political Behavior*. Twenty-seven percent of the 63 government teachers in the state of Texas used this package while 25 percent of the 89 government teachers in California used the materials.

Table 4

	Number Teaching Courses In American History	Users of *Units In American History*	
		No.	%
California	141	9	6
Colorado	129	15	12
Connecticut	154	21	14
Texas	100	2	2
Total	524	47	9

(2) American History. American history is clearly the most frequently taught subject among the respondents, with 524 of 980 respondents indicating they teach one or more such courses. However Table 4 shows only nine percent of the 524 teachers used *Units in American History* in these courses, making this package the new social studies curriculum least used in an appropriate course. Perhaps this is so because *Units in American History* is not a textbook or course of study but rather a series of separate units on specific events in the history of the United States. As such, it is probably more commonly used as supplemental material in many courses than as the basis for a semester or one-year course in American history.

Table 5

	Number Teaching Courses in Anthropology	Users of *Patterns in Human History*	
		No.	%
California	14	6	43
Colorado	10	3	30
Connecticut	14	7	50
Texas	1	0	0
Total	39	16	41

(3) Anthropology. The only one of the nine programs specifically designed for use in anthropology courses is *Patterns in Human History*. Of the 39 respondents teaching courses in anthropology, 16 or 41 percent were users of this program, as shown in Table 5. Although the user data reported in Table 2 indicate that *Patterns in Human History* had the least total usage of the nine packages, it had the highest relative usage among teachers of a related course.

(4) Geography. Seventy-nine respondents indicated they were currently teaching geography. Of this number, 22, or 28 percent, used *Geography in an Urban Age*, as shown in Table 6 on the following page. Colorado led in usage of this program, with 50 percent of the 26 geography teachers using it. Eleven teachers from Texas responded that they were teaching geography, but none used these materials.

Table 6

	Number Teaching Courses in Geography	Users of *Geography in an Urban Age*	
		No.	%
California	31	6	19
Colorado	26	13	50
Connecticut	11	3	27
Texas	11	0	0
Total	79	22	28

(5) Sociology. Like anthopology and geography, sociology is not well represented as a social studies course. Only 89 of the 980 responding teachers indicated they were teaching sociology. Of these

Table 7

	Number Teaching Courses in Sociology	Users of *Episodes in Social Inquiry*	
		No.	%
California	23	8	35
Colorado	29	13	45
Connecticut	27	6	22
Texas	10	5	50
Total	89	32	36

89 teachers, 36 percent reported using *Episodes in Social Inquiry*, as shown in Table 7.

The data of Tables 2-7 are summarized and compared in Table 8 on the following page, omitting the breakdown by states.

Table 8 shows that the percentages of use of the individual packages in the total sample varies from four to ten percent. However, the percentages for use of appropriate materials in specific subject area courses varies from nine to 41 percent. These figures indicate that while the specific subject area packages did not have a high percentage of overall use, they did have a substantially higher percentage of use in courses related to those subject areas. For example, *Patterns of Human History* was used by only four percent of the total sample of

Table 8

Comparison of Overall Use of Materials with Use of Materials in Specific, Appropriate Courses					
	Number of Respondents Using Materials Total Sample, N=980		Number of Respondents Teaching Specific Courses and Using Appropriate Materials		
	Users	Percent	Respondents Teaching Specific Courses	Respondents Using Appropriate Materials	Percent
American Political Behavior	94	10	264	55	21
Episodes in Social Inquiry	60	6	89	32	36
Units in American History	56	6	524	47	9
Geography in an Urban Age	55	6	79	22	28
Patterns in Human History	36	4	89	16	41

teachers, but 41 percent of all anthropology teachers sampled used the package. *Units in American History* seems to be the exception to this trend, possibly because of its separate unit format. The figures in Table 8 should be taken as the upper bounds on the use of materials, in view of the probable bias in the rate of questionnaire return.

Characteristics of Users of New Social Studies Programs

After determining the extent of use of the nine new social studies programs in four states, the background characteristics of users were analyzed to see if relationships between user characteristics and extent of use existed. Seven variables were analyzed in terms of percentage of users within categories.

Age. Is the age of the teacher a factor in determining whether new programs are implemented in the schools? To assess this variable respondents were asked:

What is your age?

1. _____20-29
2. _____30-39
3. _____40-49
4. _____Over 50

The existing research on this question is varied. Leas (1965), Rogers (1965), and Miles (1973) suggest that innovators are young. On the other hand, Hensel (1969), in a study of opinion leaders among teachers of vocational agriculture, found that older teachers tend to be opinion leaders. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) report that earlier adopters are no different in age from later adopters. These contradictory conclusions suggest the need for clarification through further research.

The analysis of our data shows only a slight indication that teachers in the younger and middle age groups were actually using the new materials more and the older teachers using them less; however, the difference is not statistically significant at the .05 level. As shown in Table 9, the usage rates in all of the age groups was approximately 42 percent, with the exception of those over 49 years of age, whose reported rate was 37 percent.

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Users, by Age Groups			
Age in Years	Number of Respondents	Number of Users	Percent of Users
20-29	292	123	42
30-39	326	138	42
40-49	221	95	43
Over 49	141	52	37
Total	980	408	42
$X^2 = 1.5288$	df = 3	$.50 < P < .70$	

Years of Teaching Experience. The second background characteristic studied was years of teaching experience. The question asked in the questionnaire was:

At the conclusion of this academic year, how many years teaching experience will you have had?_____

Leas (1965), when comparing the innovative teacher with the traditional teacher, found that the innovative teacher had less teaching experience. In a study of 1,559 faculty members at six widely diverse colleges in three states, Wilson and Gaff (1970) found that faculty from the senior ranks tended to oppose educational change. On the other hand, Hensel (1969) found that opinion leaders had taught longer than other teachers. Chesler (1966) also concluded that the innovative teacher tended to have more teaching experience that the non-innovator.

The data in Table 10 indicate that teachers with the least experience and those with the most experience are somewhat less likely to use new materials. The percentage of users within categories increases from 38 percent for inexperienced teachers, peaks at 47 percent for teachers with seven to nine years of teaching experience, then decreases to 35 percent for the most experienced group. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that the least experienced and most experienced teachers are less likely to innovate. However, the results are not statistically significant at the .05 level, as indicated by the chi-square test.

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Users, by Years of Teaching Experience			
Years Teaching Experience	Number of Respondents	Number of Users	Percent of Users
1-3	172	65	38
4-6	180	80	44
7-9	167	79	47
10-12	141	61	43
13-18	171	71	42
Over 18	149	52	35
Total	980	408	42
$X^2 = 6.7130$	df = 5	.20< P< .30	

Professional Organization Memberships. To ascertain whether membership in professional associations and organizations had any relationship to use of new materials, the following question was asked:

To how many professional organizations do you belong?

_____

There is little available research directly addressing this question. Lionberger (1960) found that opinion leaders are active in all types of formal organizations and are more likely to be members of groups dedicated to civic and educational improvement.

Rogers (1965) suggested that innovators are more likely to find impersonal sources of information important and are more cosmopolite in their orientation. Professional organizations may serve as sources of impersonal information and may provide a cosmopolitan outlook for their members.

In his summary of research of various independent variables relating to innovativeness, Miles (1973) generalized that (1) earlier adopters have a higher degree of social mobility than later adopters and (2) earlier adopters have higher aspirations than later adopters. Although neither of these generalizations is directly related to organizational membership, it seems to follow that people with such characteristics might satisfy these characteristics through membership in a professional organization.

The analysis of the data related to professional organization membership shown in Table 11 on the following page indicates that the more professional organizations to which a teacher belongs, the more likely he or she is to be a user of new materials. Of the respondents not holding organizational memberships, only 31 percent were users of the new materials. As the number of memberships in an organization increased, so did the percentage of users, with 57 percent of the respondents holding membership in over four organizations using the new social studies curriculum materials. This pattern was generally true in the four states surveyed. Seventy-four percent of the respondents holding over four professional memberships in the state of Connecticut were users of the new materials. The result for the four states

Table 11

Number and Percentage of Users, by Organizational Membership

Number of Memberships	Number of Respondents N=980	Number of Users	Percent of Users	California N=288			Colorado N=235			Connecticut N=277			Texas N=180		
				No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users
0	113	35	31	38	11	29	34	13	38	29	10	34	12	1	8
1-2	380	146	38	114	54	47	91	37	41	102	42	41	73	13	18
3-4	362	156	43	96	41	43	87	39	45	107	52	49	72	24	33
Over 4	125	71	57	40	19	48	23	14	61	39	29	74	23	9	39
Total	980	408	42	288	125	43	235	103	44	277	133	48	180	47	26

For four states combined, $X^2 = 19.0218$ df = 3 $P < .001$

combined is statistically significant at the .001 level. Chi-square tests were not made for the individual states.

Professional Status. Do department chairpersons tend to provide leadership within their schools in using new materials? Or is the classroom teacher more likely to choose new materials? The following question was asked:

What is your current position?_____

The research findings which seem most pertinent to this inquiry are also those which relate to professional organization membership. Social mobility and degree of aspiration are manifested in professional status. Miles (1973) noted that social status is related to organizational memberships and professional status. Hensel (1969) found that opinion leaders had attained a higher educational status than their fellow teachers and held a higher number of educational offices.

Of the total number of study respondents, 780 were teachers, 101 were department chairpersons, and the remaining 99 held a variety of positions, including curriculum coordinator, administrator, counselor, and coach. The largest number in this "other" group were coaches.

The data in Table 12 on the following page indicate that of the 101 department chairpersons, 64, or 63 percent, were users of the new materials, while only 41 percent of the teachers indicated use. In the group indicating a position other than department chairperson or teacher, only 22 percent were users of new materials. For the four states combined, the results are statistically significant at the .001 level. Chi-square tests were not made for the data on individual states.

In all states a higher percentage of chairpersons than classroom teachers used the new materials and a smaller percentage of "others" (with the exception of Connecticut where the sample of "others" numbered only seven). The differences among the three groups were most marked in Colorado and least marked in Texas. The leadership position of the department chairperson seems to extend to the use of new curriculum materials.

Status of Teaching Contract. Much of the research on innovation indicates that the element of risk may be a major barrier to the adoption and use of new programs, materials, or ideas. In a review of research

Table 12

Number and Percentage of Users, by Current Position															
Position of Respondents	Number of Respondents N=980	Number of Users	Percent of Users	California N=288			Colorado N=235			Connecticut N=277			Texas N=180		
				No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users
Teacher	780	322	41	227	98	43	182	80	44	240	105	44	131	39	30
Department Chairperson	101	64	63	37	22	59	25	18	72	30	21	70	9	3	33
Others*	99	22	22	24	5	21	28	5	18	7	7	100	40	5	13
Total	980	408	42	288	125	43	235	103	44	277	133	48	180	47	26

*"Others" include curriculum coordinators, administrators, counselors, and coaches.

For four states combined, $X^2 = 34.9958$ df = 2 $P < .001$

in anthropology, rural sociology, medicine, and education, Hahn (1973) found that innovations "low in risk" were likely to be adopted. In another summary of research, Jwaideh and Marker (1973) concluded that innovators must be willing to take risks. Rafky (1971) carried this idea even further when he found that the willingness of 240 elementary school teachers to devote time and interest to the implementation of new programs was strongly related to self-interest.

Since permanent contracts and tenure assure against loss of job, it could be hypothesized that teachers with such contracts would be more likely to take risks than those without this assurance. The opposite viewpoint is expounded in much of the research about bureaucracies. March and Simon (1958) suggest that the longer one stays in any bureaucratic system, the less flexible and innovative he becomes in his role behavior. Standardization of rules and regulations may inhibit even permanent employees from operating in innovative ways.

To find out if teachers with tenure were more likely to use new materials, the following question was asked of respondents:

Do you have a permanent contract?

1. _____Yes
2. _____No

The responses to this question are shown in Table 13, on the next page. Of the 980 respondents, 762 had permanent teaching contracts. Of this number, 345, or 45 percent, indicated they were using one or more of the new materials. However, of the 218 respondents who did not have permanent contracts, only 29 percent indicated they were using these materials. The figures indicate that a higher percentage of persons having permanent contracts seem willing to take the risks which may accompany the use of new materials. For the four states combined, the difference is statistically significant at the .001 level. Chi-square tests were not made for the individual states.

The results vary considerably among the four states. In terms of the absolute differences between percentages of tenured and non-tenured persons who used the new materials, the gap runs from six percent for California to 22 percent for Colorado.

Table 13

Number and Percentage of Users, by Permanent Contract

Have Permanent Contract	Number of Respondents N=980	Number of Users	Percent of Users	California N=288			Colorado N=235			Connecticut N=277			Texas N=180		
				No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users
Yes	762	345	45	254	112	44	190	91	48	231	116	50	87	26	30
No	218	63	29	34	13	38	45	12	26	46	17	37	93	21	23
Total	980	408	42	288	125	43	235	103	44	277	133	48	180	47	26

For four states combined, $X^2 = 18.6886$ df = 1 $P < .001$

Location of School. The belief is commonly held that people in rural areas are more conservative, hold traditional values longer, and are reluctant to adopt new practices. Research largely supports these generalizations. Gehlen (1969) characterized the small, rural school as having a limited curriculum, a conservative tax picture, and a conservative faculty and staff. In a report on Iowa schools, Maxey and Thomas (1968) found that the best qualified staffs were in schools with enrollments of 1,500 and above. Schools of this size are most frequently found in urban and suburban areas. Zeigler (1969) noted that urban inner-city schools were less likely to innovate, except in times of crisis, while suburban schools were more likely to innovate.

To ascertain whether differences exist in the extent to which new materials are used in rural, small town, urban-inner city, and urban-suburban schools, the following question was asked:

> Which one of the following best characterizes the location of your school?
>
> 1. _____Urban-inner city
> 2. _____Urban-suburban
> 3. _____Small town
> 4. _____Rural

In reporting the results, the data for small towns and rural areas were combined, because the number of respondents from rural areas was small and the data gathered in rural schools appeared similar to that from small towns. For the four states combined, the differences shown are significant at the .001 level. Chi-square tests were not made for individual states.

The data support the view held in the research that teachers in urban schools are more likely to be innovators or users of new materials than are teachers in small-town schools. Zeigler's research is also supported, since teachers characterizing their school as urban-suburban had a higher percentage of usage (49 percent) than those who described their schools as urban, inner-city (40 percent).

Size of School. School size and location are clearly related; however, it is possible for the two factors to operate independently.

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Users, by Location of School

Location of School	Number of Respondents N=980	Number of Users	Percent of Users	California N=288			Colorado N=235			Connecticut N=277			Texas N=180		
				No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users
Urban-Inner City	112	45	40	33	9	27	43	21	49	19	8	42	17	7	41
Urban-Suburban	495	244	49	179	89	50	104	59	57	142	69	49	70	27	39
Small Town-Rural	373	119	32	76	27	90	88	23	41	116	56	114	93	13	30
Total	980	408	42	288	125	43	235	103	44	277	133	48	180	47	26

For four states combined, $X^2 = 26.5580$ df = 2 $P < .001$

There are sizable consolidated schools in rural areas which have graduating classes of over 500 students. There are also a few small, urban-suburban schools in recently populated areas. Previous research seems to link the two variables, but in this study the two factors were treated separately to determine if school size does have a distinguishable effect on the use of new materials. The following question was asked:

What was the approximate size of your school's most recent graduating class?

1. _____Under 100
2. _____100-300
3. _____301-500
4. Over 500

Past evidence leads to the conclusion that teachers in larger schools are more likely to use innovative curriculum materials than are those in smaller schools. Table 15 indicates that the data collected in this study support this statement. Twenty-four percent of the teachers in schools with graduating classes under 100 students were using new materials. In schools with graduating classes over 500 students, 53 percent of the teachers used new social studies materials. For schools of intermediate size, the percentages of respondents using the new materials were about 42 percent.

For the four states combined, the differences are statistically significant at the .001 level. Chi-square tests were not made for the individual states.

User Perceptions about Quality of New Social Studies Materials

While it is important to know how many teachers are using new social studies curriculum materials, it is even more desirable to know how teachers perceived the quality of these materials when they were used. To determine user perceptions, questions developed for the Curriculum Information Network (Morrissett 1973) were included in the questionnaire.

The questions included were designed to ascertain how teachers feel about the materials and how they feel the materials compare with other social studies programs. The specific questions asked for each of the

Table 15

Number and Percentage of Users, by Size of School's Graduating Class

Size of Graduating Class	Number of Respondents N=980	Number of Users	Percent of Users	California N=288			Colorado N=235			Connecticut N=277			Texas N=180		
				No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users	No. of Respondents	No. of Users	% of Users
Under 100	147	36	24	33	15	45	55	12	22	10	4	40	49	5	10
101-300	259	111	43	48	14	29	54	25	46	132	66	50	25	6	24
301-500	357	147	41	147	66	45	54	22	41	100	42	42	56	17	30
Over 500	217	114	53	60	30	50	72	44	61	35	21	60	50	19	38
Total	980	408	42	288	125	43	235	103	44	277	133	48	180	47	26

For four states combined, $X^2 = 28.5474$ $df = 3$ $P < .001$

nine curriculum materials programs were:

1. How often did these materials work well with your students?
2. How do these materials compare with other social studies materials you have used?
3. Would you recommend these materials for use by others?

Tables 16 through 24 report the responses of program users to each of the nine curriculum materials.

Table 16

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *American Political Behavior*

Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	11	12	Much better	27	29	Yes	40	43
Often	53	56	Better	48	51	Yes, with qualifi-cations	51	54
Sometimes	25	27	About same	15	16			
Rarely	3	3	Worse	3	3	No	3	3
Never	2	2	Much worse	1	1			
Total	94	100		94	100		94	100

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Asian Studies Inquiry Series*

Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	6	16	Much better	9	24	Yes	17	45
Often	19	50	Better	20	53	Yes, with qualifi-cations	21	55
Sometimes	10	26	About same	7	18			
Rarely	2	5	Worse	1	2.5			
Never	1	3	Much worse	1	2.5	No	0	0
Total	38	100		38	100		38	100

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Episodes in Social Inquiry*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	8	13	Much better	10	17	Yes	22	37
Often	33	55	Better	41	68	Yes, with qualifi-cations	36	60
Sometimes	18	30	About same	8	13			
Rarely	1	2	Worse	1	2	No	2	3
Never	0	0	Much worse	0	0			
Total	60	100		60	100		60	100

Table 19

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Geography in an Urban Age*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	11	20	Much better	16	29	Yes	20	36
Often	33	60	Better	30	54	Yes, with qualifi-cations	33	60
Sometimes	9	16	About same	7	13			
Rarely	1	2	Worse	1	2			
Never	0	0	Much worse	0	0	No	1	2
No response	1	2	No response	1	2	No response	1	2
Total	55	100		55	100		55	100

Table 20

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Holt Social Studies Series*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	9	7	Much better	12	9	Yes	27	20
Often	65	47	Better	72	52	Yes, with qualifi-cations	94	68
Sometimes	55	40	About same	39	28			
Rarely	6	4	Worse	13	9			
Never	2	1	Much worse	1	1	No	13	9
No response	1	1	No response	1	1	No response	4	3
Total	138	100		138	100		138	100

Table 21

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Justice in Urban America*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	8	12	Much better	7	10.5	Yes	37	55.2
Often	39	58.2	Better	40	57.7	Yes, with qualifi-cations	25	37.3
Sometimes	15	22.3	About same	15	22.3			
Rarely	2	3	Worse	2	3			
Never	0	0	Much worse	0	0	No	2	3
No response	3	4.5	No response	3	4.5	No response	3	4.5
Total	67	100		67	100		67	100

Table 22

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Patterns in Human History*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	11	31	Much better	14	39	Yes	17	47
Often	16	44	Better	16	44	Yes, with qualifi-cations	16	44
Sometimes	7	19	About same	4	11			
Rarely	1	3	Worse	1	3			
Never	0	0	Much worse	0	0	No	2	6
No response	1	3	No response	1	3	No response	1	3
Total	36	100		36	100		36	100

Table 23

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Public Issues Series*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	10	9	Much better	18	17	Yes	47	44
Often	75	71	Better	70	66	Yes, with qualifi-cations	57	54
Sometimes	20	19	About same	16	15			
Rarely	0	0	Worse	1	1			
Never	1	1	Much worse	1	1	No	2	2
Total	106	100		106	100		106	100

Table 24

Number and Percentage Distribution of Perceived Quality of *Units in American History*								
Did Materials Work Well?	No.	%	How Well Compared	No.	%	Would You Recommend For Use?	No.	%
Always	19	34	Much better	19	34	Yes	25	44
Often	20	36	Better	26	46	Yes, with qualifi-cations	28	50
Sometimes	13	23	About same	7	13			
Rarely	3	5	Worse	1	2			
Never	0	0	Much worse	0	0	No	1	2
No response	1	2	No response	3	5	No response	2	4
Total	56	100		56	100		56	100

To rank the nine sets of materials from those most favorably perceived to those least favorably perceived by users, a scoring system was established for responses to the three perception questions. The scores were determined by assigning a numerical value to each possible response for each of the three questions. Numerical values were assigned as follows:

Question 1: How often did these materials work well with your students?

Responses	Numerical Values
Always worked well	1
Often worked well	2
Sometimes worked well	3
Rarely worked well	4
Never worked well	5

Question 2: How do these materials compare with other social studies materials you have used?

Responses	Numerical Values
Much better	1
Better	2
About the same	3
Worse	4
Much worse	5

Question 3: Would you recommend these materials for use by others?

Responses	Numerical Values
Yes	1
Yes, with qualification	3
No	5

After a numerical value was assigned to each response, an average of the values was computed. If all respondents said "always worked well," the average score would be 1.0; if all said "never worked well," the average would be 5.0. Rated on all three questions, the best possible score for a set of materials is 3.0; the worst possible score is 15.0.

Effectiveness of Materials in Classroom Use. Table 25 reports the score received by each curriculum program on each of the three questions. A total score for all three questions is also reported for each curriculum program. The materials are ranked in this table from the most favorable total score to the least favorable total score.

Looking first at the total score by program, *Patterns in Human History* has the most favorable score--5.9. Although this result is based on only 36 responses, and as with similar thin responses throughout the survey should be judged with caution, it is interesting that users of this material generally responded favorably to all three questions about its use in the classroom. Total scores for the other materials range up to 7.7.

The averages for the three columns are of interest. The users of new materials indicate that on the whole the materials compared well with "other" materials in classroom use. The average classroom success score is 2.16 which places it between "often worked well" and "sometimes worked well," but closer to "often worked well."

Comparison of Materials with Other Social Studies Materials. In comparing the new materials with other social studies materials, users perceived the new materials as "better"; the average score was 2.04. While the ranking system used in Table 25 on the following page puts some materials at the top and some at the bottom in terms of scoring, it seems that the selected group of nine, taken as a whole, is judged superior to the other materials being used by social studies teachers.

Table 25

Weighted Responses to Three Questions Dealing with Quality of Materials

Rank	Materials Title	No. of Users	How Well Materials Worked	How Materials Compare	Would you Recommend to Others?	Total
1	*Patterns in Human History*	36	1.94	1.77	2.14	5.9
2	*Geography in an Urban Age*	55	2.05	1.87	2.29	6.2
3	*Public Issues Series*	106	2.12	2.02	2.15	6.3
4	*Units in American History*	56	2.00	2.16	2.11	6.3
5	*Justice in Urban America*	67	2.17	2.18	1.90	6.3
6	*American Political Behavior*	94	2.27	1.96	2.21	6.4
7	*Episodes in Social Inquiry*	60	2.20	2.00	2.33	6.5
8	*Asian Studies Inquiry Series*	38	2.28	2.07	2.10	6.5
9	*Holt Social Studies Curriculum*	138	2.46	2.40	2.79	7.7
	Averages		2.16	2.04	2.22	6.45
	Most favorable score possible		1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00
	Least favorable score possible		5.00	5.00	5.00	15.00

Recommendation of Materials to Other Users. Responses to the final question, "Would you recommend these materials for use by others?" indicate that users would recommend the materials with some qualifications. The average score is 2.22, about midway between "Yes" and "Yes, with qualifications," but a little closer to the latter. Average

responses for individual packages range from 1.90 to 2.79.

There are two possibilities of bias in these results. One is that teachers more favorably disposed toward the materials studied may have responded to the questionnaire in greater numbers than those less favorably impressed. The other is that a "halo" effect may exist; teachers who feel that they are being innovative may show a favorable bias toward their innovation. Taken at face value, however, the total score for each of the nine curriculum materials programs indicates that they work well in the classroom, compare well with other materials, and would be recommended to other teachers by the users.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The purposes of this study were to (1) determine the extent of use of nine social studies programs in four states; (2) to collect and analyze data about the characteristics of users; and (3) to collect and analyze data about how users perceived the effectiveness of materials in classroom use.

The data to provide answers to these questions were collected by questionnaires from social studies teachers in a randomly selected subsample of 600 (150 from each state) secondary schools in California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Texas. Nine hundred-eighty teachers (20.5 percent) responded to the 4,783 questionnaires sent out. The data were collected during the spring of 1974.

Summary of Findings

The following are the major findings of the study:

1. Of 980 respondents, 408, or 42 percent, were users of at least one of the nine sets of social studies materials.
2. Forty-eight percent of the practitioners from Connecticut were using at least one of the nine programs; 44 percent from Colorado; 43 percent from California; and 26 percent from Texas.
3. The most widely used of the nine programs was the *Holt Social Studies Series*. One hundred thirty-eight respondents (14 percent) indicated they were using these materials in the classroom, with the largest percentage of users coming from California and the smallest from Texas.
4. *Patterns in Human History*, an anthropology program, was least used, with only 36 respondents (four percent) indicating use.
5. *American Political Behavior*, the third most frequently used program, with 94 teachers (ten percent) indicating use, did not follow the typical use pattern of other programs. In Texas, a state textbook adoption state, *APB* is the only one of the nine materials which appears on the approved list.

With all other materials, Texas had the fewest users. With *APB*, 12 percent of the Texas respondents indicated use, putting Texas second in percentage of users.

6. Twenty-seven percent (264) of the respondents teach courses in American government. Of this number 21 percent (55) used *American Political Behavior*, the program most appropriate for such courses.
7. Thirty-nine of the respondents indicated they are teaching courses in anthropology. Of this number 41 percent (16) were using *Patterns in Human History*, an anthropology program.
8. Seventy-nine teachers stated they are teaching geography courses. Twenty-two, or 28 percent, of this group used *Geography in an Urban Age*.
9. Eighty-nine teachers, nine percent of the sample, are teaching sociology. Of this number, 36 percent (32) used *Episodes in Social Inquiry*, a sociology program.
10. Fifty-three percent of all the respondents (524) are teaching American history courses, but only nine percent (47) used *Units in American History*.
11. Although anthropology, geography, and sociology are not well represented in social studies course offerings, a significant percentage of practitioners teaching these courses used the new social studies material specific to the discipline.
12. The data indicate that teachers over 49 years of age used the new programs least, but this finding is not statistically significant.
13. Respondents with less than four years of teaching experience and those with over 18 years of experience indicated less use than teachers with between four and 18 years of experience. Again, this result is not statistically significant.
14. Those teachers who belong to one or more professional organizations were more likely to use new materials than those teachers who do not. Only 31 percent of the teachers with no organizational affiliation were users, while 57 percent of those who reported four or more organizational memberships were users.

This result, as well as those numbered 15 to 18 below, is statistically significant at the .001 level.

15. The professional status of users, as described by current position, bears a positive relationship to use of new materials. Department chairpersons represented only ten percent of the total respondents but 63 percent were users. Of the teachers responding, only 41 percent were users of new materials. Of those who describe themselves as curriculum coordinators, administrators, counselors, and coaches (ten percent of total) only 22 percent used one or more of the nine programs.
16. Whether teachers have or do not have a permanent contract affected use of the new materials. Forty-five percent of those with permanent contracts were users, while only 29 percent without contracts were users.
17. Teachers from urban-suburban schools used new materials to a greater extent than teachers from any other category of schools. Teachers in rural and small town schools used the new materials least often.
18. Fifty-three percent of the teachers in schools with graduating classes of more than 500 were users of the new materials, while only 24 percent of those from schools with graduating classes under 100 were users.
19. Of the nine programs, *Patterns in Human History* was judged most favorably by users in three dimensions--how well the material worked with students, how well the material compared with other social studies materials, and the degree to which it was recommended for use by other teachers.
20. The second most favorably perceived program was *Geography in an Urban Age*, followed by *Public Issues Series, Units in American History, Justice in Urban America, American Political Behavior, Episodes in Social Inquiry, Asian Studies Inquiry Series,* and *Holt Social Studies Series*.

Conclusions

Based upon the foregoing findings, the following conclusions seem appropriate:

1. Teachers in the secondary schools surveyed are not using the new social studies materials in substantial numbers.
2. The limited use of *Patterns in Human History, Geography in An Urban Age,* and *Episodes in Social Inquiry* is partially explained by the fact that only a limited number of courses in anthropology, geography, and sociology are being taught.
3. The fact that the *Holt Social Studies Series* is a multi-level, multi-discipline program partially accounts for its being the most used program. However, it is unlikely that most respondents use all components of the Holt materials.
4. Holding a permanent contract, which tends to protect against threat of job loss, may encourage some teachers to adopt innovative programs.
5. Both professional status, as described by current position, and extent of membership in professional organizations seem to be important characteristics of users. Department chairpersons seem most likely to use new materials, while coaches and others who are not primarily classroom teachers seem least likely to use such materials.
6. The location of schools (urban-suburban, urban-inner city, small town, and rural) and the number of students in a school are important determinants of use. Large, urban-suburban schools have the largest percentage of teachers using materials.
7. Secondary teachers who do use the new programs have positive opinions about how well the materials work in their classrooms, how well the materials compare with other social studies curricula, and whether they would recommend use to other teachers.

References

Barrett, H. G. "Personal Conflicts and Culture Change." *Social Forces*. Vol. 20 (1941) pp. 160-171.

Bragaw, Donald H. "Social Studies Survey." Unpublished social studies survey. Albany, New York: State Department of Education, 1974.

Brennan, Leonard. "Teacher Acceptance and Rejection of Innovation in Classroom Practice." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.

Camaren, Reuben James. "Innovation as a Factor Influencing the Diffusion and Adoption Process." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1966.

Cawelti, Gordon. "Innovative Practice in High Schools: Who Does What, Why and How." *Nation's Schools*. Vol. 79 (April 1967) pp. 54-74.

Chesler, Mark A. *Social Structure and Innovation in Elementary Schools*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1966. ED 014 817.

Christiansen, J. E., and R. E. Taylor. *The Adoption of Educational Innovations among Teachers of Vocational Agriculture: A Digest of a Ph.D. Dissertation*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1966.

Elliott, John Gerrard. "Farmers' Perception of Innovations as Resulted to Self-Concept and Adoption." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1968.

Erasmus, Charles John. "Agricultural Changes in Haiti: Patterns of Resistance and Acceptance." *Human Organization*. Vol. 11 (Winter 1952) p. 26.

Fliegel, Frederick C., and Joseph E. Kivlin. "Farmers' Perceptions of Farm Practice Attributes." *Rural Sociology*. Vol. 31 (June 1966) pp. 197-206.

Frost, J. L., and G. R. Hawkes, eds. *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. 2d ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.

Gehlen, Frieda L. *The Political Aspects of Small Town and Rural Schools*. Las Cruces, New Mexico: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, 1969. ED 030 502.

Geib, Richard D. "HSGP: From Boulder to Boondocks." Unpublished Master's thesis. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1972.

Goodlad, J. I. "Learning and Teaching in the Future." *NEA Journal*. Vol. 57 (1968) p. 49.

Guenther, John, and Wayne Dumas. *The National Social Studies Projects: A Survey of Curriculum Implementation in Missouri and Kansas.* Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1971.

Hahn, Carol L. "Relationships between Potential Adopters' Perceptions of New Social Studies Materials and Their Adoption of Those Materials in Indiana and Ohio." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1973.

Havelock, Ronald G. *Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination an Utilization of Knowledge.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1971.

Hensel, James W., and Cecil H. Johnson. *The Identification of Opinion Leaders Among Teachers of Vocational Agriculture. Final Report.* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1969. ED 030 764.

Jwaideh, Alice, and Gerald Marker. *Bringing About Change in Social Studies Education.* Boulder, Colorado: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1973. ED 083 091.

Kim, Yungho, and Daniel W. Kratochvil. *Development Economic Education Program (DEEP), Product Report No. 16.* Palo Alto, California: American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1972.

Leas, Albert. "A Study to Determine the Characteristics of Innovative and Traditional Educators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1965.

Linton, Ralph. "Cultural and Personality Factors Affecting Economic Growth." In *The Progress of Underdeveloped Areas,* B. F. Hoselitz, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Lionberger, H. F. *Adoption of New Ideas and Problems.* Ames, Iowa: Iowa University Press, 1960.

March, James, and Herbert Simon. *Organizations.* New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Maxey, E. James, and Donald R. Thomas. *Selected Comparisons of Teacher and Curriculum Characteristics Related to Education Innovation for the Great Plains.* Unpublished paper, 1968. ED 004 686.

Miles, Matthew B., ed. *Innovation in Education.* New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Miles, Thomas T. "An Analysis of Personality Factors, Life Experience Items, and Attitudes toward Media as Related to Innovativeness for Selected Iowa Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1973.

Morrissett, Irving. "CIN (Curriculum Information Network) First Report: Evaluation of Curriculum Materials." *Social Education*. Vol. 37 (November 1973) pp. 665-668.

_____. "CIN (Curriculum Information Network) Second Report--Innovation: Its Climate and Its Helpers." *Social Education*. Vol. 38 (October 1974) pp. 555-559.

_____. "CIN (Curriculum Information Network) Third Report: Ratings of 24 Social Studies Materials." *Social Education*. (Forthcoming February 1975.)

Mort, P. R. *Principles of School Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Mort, P. R., and F. G. Cornell. *American Schools in Transition*. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Polgar, Steven, Howard Dunphy, and Bruce Cox. "Diffusion and Farming Advice: A Test of Some Current Notions." *Social Forces*. Vol. 42 (October 1963) pp. 104-111.

Rafky, David M., and Marvin Beckerman. *Teachers' Acceptance of Innovations: Self-Interest, Altruism and Professionalization*. Unpublished paper with the cooperation and support of the Central New York School Study Council at Syracuse University, 1971. ED 079 267

Richburg, James R. "Curriculum Diffusion. Dissemination and Adoption of Materials in the Anthropology Curriculum Project." Unpublished Master's thesis. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1969.

Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion of Innovation*. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

_____. "What Are Innovators Like?" In *Change Process in the Public School*, by Richard Carlson *et al*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965. ED 014 124.

Rogers, Everett M., with F. Floyd Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach*. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Ross, Donald H. "Measuring Institutional Quality of School Systems." *Teachers College Record*. 1955. p. 57.

Sanderson, Barbara A., and Daniel W. Kratochvil. *Holt Social Studies Curriculum Product Development Report No. 13*. Palo Alto, California: American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1972.

Suttles, Wayne. "The Early Diffusion of the Potato Among the Coast Salish." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. Vol. 7 (1951) pp. 272-278.

Switzer, Thomas J., Malcolm A. Lowther, William M. Hanna, and Ralph D. Kidder. "Dissemination and Implementation of Social Studies Project Materials." A research report prepared for delivery at the 54th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, 1974.

Wilson, Robert C., and Jerry G. Gaff. *Faculty Supporters of Change*. Berkeley, California: University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970. ED 045 029.

Zeigler, Harmon, and Karl Johnson. "Educational Innovation and Politico-Economic Systems." *Education and Urban Society*. Vol. 1 (February 1969) pp. 161-175.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

by

Gerald W. Marker
Indiana University

This concluding chapter briefly reviews the results of the three studies which form the body of this report. Some comparisons are made concerning what has been learned about user awareness, the characteristics of adopters, the characteristics of the innovations themselves, and the degree of user satisfaction with the new products. The chapter concludes with some recommendations for action that seem warranted by these three studies as well as some suggestions for further research.

Awareness of Innovations

The change process is a complex set of interactions of which diffusion is only one facet.* But, regardless of where an innovation originates, unless potential users become aware of it and give it a trial, the use of the innovation will not spread. Thus, while diffusion does not insure change, its absence reduces change to local invention.

The first step in the diffusion process is to create awareness of the innovation. Political candidates see it as a matter of public recognition but, whatever the name of the game, people need to have heard of the innovation. In her study, Hahn found that 50 percent of the persons who were designated by their principal as "one of those who had the most influence in the selection of social studies materials in the school" were not familiar with any of the 22 items on her list of new materials. The Switzer study produced very similar findings, with only one project (Carnegie-Mellon) being "heard of" by more than 50 percent of the respondents. While the Turner-Haley questionnaire contained an awareness item, only actual user data were reported.

A doctoral dissertation done at the University of Nebraska by Walker (1974) found a greater proportion of respondents aware of the social studies project materials than was the case in the three studies reported here. Walker's study involved 353 schools, 126 of which were using some social studies project materials. Of the 227 schools not using any of the new materials, only 96 were unaware of any of the 20 sets of project

*For an excellent discussion of how individuals and organizations change, see Alan K. Gaynor (1975). Also see Chapter 10, "Authority Innovation--Decisions and Organizational Change," in Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) and Brickell (1961).

materials selected for his study. Thus only 27.2 percent (96) of the schools had never heard of the new alternatives available to them.

Perhaps some readers will be alarmed at the large proportion of persons in the field who are professionally uninformed, but the situation apparently improves if one controls for the subject taught. In the Switzer study over 90 percent of those teaching anthropology had heard of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project (ACSP), while only 42.9 percent of those same teachers were aware of the Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (SRSS) materials. On the other hand, 69.7 percent of the of the sociology teachers were aware of the SRSS materials but only 30.3 percent of them knew of the ACSP materials. Not unexpectedly, teachers appear to be more aware of innovations in their own teaching area than they are of what is going on in the other subject areas. A similar pattern holds when one shifts from "heard of" to "examined." After all, why bother to look at something which one has no reason to use?

If the diffusion of educational innovations is like the diffusion of other innovations, those who are aware of new things are not randomly distributed. Apparently, as an occupational group, teachers are normal--that is, the usual characteristics seem to correlate with awareness of innovations. Thus, if one teaches in an urban or suburban school with a large graduating class, is a department head, or is a member of the National Council for the Social Studies, he or she is more likely to be informed about "new social studies" materials.

For example, Hahn found in both her Indiana-Ohio and Georgia-Florida samples that community size made a difference, with urban and suburban respondents showing significantly higher levels of familiarity with the listed materials than respondents from small town and rural areas. She also found that respondents from schools with graduating classes larger than 250 showed significantly greater familiarity with the list materials than did respondents from schools with smaller graduating classes. Switzer found that in almost all cases there was a significant positive correlation between awareness of "new social studies" materials and membership in the National Council for the Social Studies. Interestingly enough, this relationship did not hold when applied to those at the next level, who had examined the new materials.

Only the Switzer study looked into the matter of where innovators first heard of an innovation. In most cases, though not necessarily in this order, respondents indicated that they had first heard of the new materials from either professional publications or a friend or colleague. It would have been interesting to have gotten a further breakdown of those who heard of materials from a friend or colleague to see how many of that group heard about the materials from a cosmopolite source. Switzer's comments about the low number of respondents who gave publishers as their source are important. It is quite possible that textbook sales representatives play a much more important role in the diffusion process than appears to be the case in the Switzer study. Even the casual observer can note that some publishing houses make a major effort to sell the newer materials while others seem content to stick with their older, more proven texts, even though they have the newer materials "in the car trunk" in case their customers seem particularly interested.

Adoption of Innovations

Many diffusion efforts begin and end with the creation of a state of awareness on the part of the potential adopter. But a major objective of those charged with diffusion is to create awareness in such a way as to motivate the potential adopter to give the innovation a trial. For diffusers in the pbulic sector, such as county agricultural agents and state social studies consultants, a systematic trial of an innovation is the conclusion of a successful dissemination campaign. On the other hand, those in the private sector who depend upon profit for their survival look toward positive adoption decisions (sales) as the real payoff of their diffusion efforts. The point is that awareness does not necessarily lead to trial and almost by definition all trials do not conclude with a decision to adopt permanently.

The studies reported here make no distinction between adoption and implementation, nor for that matter do most researchers. A teacher may report having "adopted" a given set of curriculum materials when classroom observation may reveal the fact that only the printed portion of a multimedia package is in use, even though the designers intended the media part

of the package to carry a major share of the instructional burden. This writer once encountered a class of students who reported that while they used the text, *American Political Behavior*, they never referred to any of the tables, graphs, or charts in the materials because their teacher said they were "too hard to read." The distinction between adoption and implementation is difficult to define operationally as one moves from the extremes toward that large middle, and probably typical, area but it is a distinction to keep in mind as we turn our attention to the question of, "Who adopts?" (Pincus 1974)

Only the Turner-Haley and Switzer sutdies report data on the background characteristics of adopters, and the latter study only in a summary form. The profile of the typical adopter shows a tenured person who is in a position of departmental leadership in a large school and who holds membership in professional organizations. Where one is located in the information network as well as the position one holds obviously influences not only the level of awareness but also the likelihood that one will adopt some of the new materials. Though the data are skimpy, the adopters of "new social studies" materials appear to have some of the characteristics of what have been termed "early adopters" (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971).

For example, Turner and Haley found that 57 percent of their respondents who belonged to four or more professional organizations were users of new materials while only 31 percent of those belonging to no professional organizations were users. If, as studies in other fields have indicated, middle and late adopters tend to learn of innovations from local opinion leaders rather than cosmopolite sources, this distinct difference should decrease over time. It should be comforting to the professional associations to know that they may be a major source of information to innovators and early adopters. Turner and Haley also found that 63 percent of the department heads in their study were users of new materials, compared to 41 percent of the teachers and that 45 percent of the teachers with permanent contracts were users while only 29 percent of those who were nontenured were users. Switzer does not report user data by categories such as tenure and age, but he does report that only 29 percent of his respondents had received instruction in the use of the new materials. No data were available to indicate the relationship between instruction in the use of the materials and their adoption.

Perceptions of Characteristics of Innovations

Thus far we have focused upon the human actors in the diffusion process. But the innovations themselves must be powerful variables. Otherwise how do we explain why some innovations such as overhead projectors seemed to sweep through the schools while others such as language laboratories moved much more slowly through the system? Was it because language labs were so expensive compared to overhead projectors? Could it have been that the labs called for a totally new approach to teaching another language while the overhead project could be adapted to whatever teaching techniques were already in use? Was it because, for a small investment, two or three overhead projectors could be given a trial on the local scene before a major purchase decision was made, while the language labs required major remodeling prior to local trial? Whatever the explanation, it is likely that how the adopters perceived the nature of these two different innovations greatly influenced their rate and pattern of adoption.

The role of perceptions in the diffusion process is sometimes confusing.* If a set of curriculum materials is in fact uncomplicated, how then can some potential adopters believe that it is "complicated and difficult to use"? Psychologists use the concepts of *selective perception* and *selective retention* to explain how different people can give widely differing accounts of the same event. What people see, hear, and remember is conditioned by a number of variables, not the least of which is their previous experience. So, frustrating as it is for developers to have their materials inaccurately perceived, from the standpoint of diffusion it is the adopter's perception and not reality which counts. For example, a small, private, four-year liberal arts college ceased operation in 1975 because, in the view of its former president, the college could not succeed in changing its image. Potential students and their parents perceived the school as fashionable, exclusive, and expensive. While such perceptions were inaccurate, the decision by students to go elshwhere was real and led to the school's being closed (Felder 1975, p. 94). In terms

*For a good review of numerous pieces of perception research relating to diffusion see Hahn's dissertation (1975).

of the decision to try something new, what one believes to be true, is true!

Of the three studies reported here only the one done by Hahn delves into the question of potential adopters' perceptions of social studies materials. One of the relationships on which the Hahn study focused was that between potential adopters' perceptions of "new social studies" materials and their willingness to adopt those materials. Hahn found significant correlations between a number of her perception subdimensions and willingness to adopt. For example, when potential adopters view an innovation as having certain attributes, such as generating greater student interest, then their attitudes toward the innovation are more favorable. If on the other hand, the potential adopter sees the innovation as being complicated and difficult to use, then his or her attitude toward the innovation is likely to be less positive.

However, Hahn's findings also contain some puzzling results concerning another relationship she examined--that between potential adopters' perceptions of innovations and the actual adoption of those innovations in their schools. There is simply no question that strong correlations exist--too many other researchers have found them--but not necessarily in the field of education. As was pointed out earlier, educational adoption decisions differ significantly from those in agriculture and medicine in that the former tend to be group decisions while the latter are almost always individual decisions. In addition, as Hahn points out, educational adoptions are confounded by state adoption laws, specified "wear-out" times, lack of direct control over expenditures, and so forth. It is probably the case that a significant relationship between attitudes and adoption also exists in education, but the relationship is not a direct one and some way will have to be invented to control for the intervening variables.

In the meantime, those planning diffusion campaigns are probably well advised to operate as if the relationship is a strong one and, in this sense, Hahn's findings are very useful. By identifying the specific attributes of innovations that correlate highly with favorable attitudes, one can invest time, money, newsletter space, and so on in those things

which seem to mean the most to potential adopters. For example, Hahn's findings would lead one to spend more time describing how a given set of materials would produce student learning observable to the teacher than in trying to show how the innovation was similar to what the teacher has used before. (Some may view such actions as manipulation, a matter that is elaborated under Recommendations for Use of Findings.)

User Satisfaction with Materials

The Turner-Haley study is the only one reporting data on user satisfaction with the new materials. Such subjective data are truly "soft"; we have nothing to indicate on what basis the user made the evaluation. It is certainly possible that an adopter would rate a new set of materials as "better" than what they had been using even though test data would show otherwise. But as has already been pointed out, if the user perceives them as "better" or "more effective," whatever the reason, then from the standpoint of diffusion research the result is the same, that is, continued use and a user who will recommend the innovation to others. While, for example, the reactions range from 55 percent who would recommend without qualification the *Justice in Urban America* materials to only 20 percent who would make such a recommendation for the *Holt Social Studies Curriculum,* on balance the materials do quite well when compared to other materials used by the respondents. In fact, if one combines the "much better" and "better" responses to the question, "How do these materials compare with other social studies materials you have used?" The lowest score still is a hefty 61 percent with an average of 77.7 percent of the users of the nine sets of materials falling into those two categories. With that level of user satisfaction, we should be able to predict continued informal diffusion of these materials.

Recommendations for Use of Findings

The Ethics of Diffusion. As a group, social studies teachers are likely to spend time discussing with their students how Madison Avenue misleads unsuspecting consumers into believing they need all sorts of

things which in fact they could easily get along without. Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders* provides popular accounts of such manipulation. Those interested in changing social studies will rightly ask, "In the name of 'progress' are we now going to employ these misleading techniques in order to get others to try and adopt 'new social studies' materials?"

Quite frankly, the answer must be that, as we gain increasing knowledge about what motivates potential adopters, we will have at our fingertips the capability to do such manipulation. But that is absolutely not what is being advocated here. Most knowledge carries with it the the potential for great harm but does not mandate that it be used for such purposes. The difference between the hard-line salesperson and the professionally motivated disseminator is one of motive. Sales representatives often attempt to sell their products regardless of the nature of customer's needs, and where there is no need they may attempt to create one. On the other hand, the professional disseminator makes a genuine effort to match the potential adopter's need to a given innovation or innovations. No attempt is made to misrepresent the innovations nor does the disseminator make any effort to steer the client toward a particular innovation because it is one he is "pushing."* In fact, the stress upon local trial of the innovation runs directly counter to the really hard-line philosophy of "sell 'em and leave 'em."

The purpose of the diffusion campaign is to make available to potential adopters the best objective data about a range of innovations appropriate to given problems or needs. In many ways it is much like the county agricultural agent helping a farmer select hybrid seed corn that is right for local conditions. This certainly is not to say that all professional educators are pure or that all salespersons are out to take advantage of their customers; but it is to argue that knowledge about what shapes the attitudes of adopters does not necessarily need to be used for manipulation.

---

*One of the best ways to determine the spirit of what is intended for professional diffusers is to examine manuals designed to be used in training such persons. Among them are: Becker and Hahn (1975); Havelock (1973); Havelock and Havelock (1973); and Jwaideh and Marker (1973).

Specific Actions. If there is one thing that stands out as one reviews these three studies, it is that a substantial proportion of the potential adopters of social studies innovations are still unaware of the major new alternatives that have been developed in the past decade. These uninformed educators tend to be located in small schools, often in rural areas, the very places that commercial publishers often find it unprofitable to visit, thus depriving those persons of a commercial source of awareness. It appears that if they are to be reached with information about social studies curriculum materials that it will have to be through the efforts of state department of education, professional associations, various diffusion activities funded by the federal government and private foundations, and university and college personnel. Even though many social studies developers have moved on to other frontiers, gone out of business, or become bored with the "new social studies revolution," much work remains to be done in the hinterlands.

Because our resources, both human and otherwise, are limited, we should go about our diffusion efforts in a way that will create the greatest awareness and trial for the least investment. Again, drawing upon the findings of these three studies, it would appear that we should work at increasing membership in professional associations such as the National Council for the Social Studies and its related state and regional councils, especially among those in leadership positions in the schools. Using Hahn's findings, we should made a special effort to make certain that teachers and administrators get information in those categories that seem to made a difference to them. By way of reminder, it is not those attributes that the developers feel are important that count in the adoption process, but rather throse which the potential users perceive to be important. To the extent that those two groups' concerns overlap, what serves one serves the other; but where they do not, precedence simply must be given to what concerns potential adopters.

Switzer's study certainly would lead us to conclude that we should make a special effort to stress the manner in which mateirals can be used in subject areas not specifically mentioned in the names of the projects that develop them. Thus, while sociology teachers would naturally be drawn to materials developed by the Sociological Resources for the Social

Studies project, teachers of economics, political science, and U.S. history should also be made aware of the various two-week units developed by that project with the specific intention that they would fit into these other courses.

Certainly the National Council for the Social Studies, which often reflects the views of persons in the forefront of the social studies movement, should continue to promote the awareness and trial of new materials. While they may no longer appear new to leaders who set policy for the Council, we are reminded again of the many persons in the field to whom they are still "new."

Those persons in the profession who have direct contact with educational publishers should systematically remind those people that, while some of the materials have now been on-line for some time, there is still a reasonably large but untapped potential market for them. In addition, well-placed questions to publishers representatives may reveal that, while the company's main office staff is aware of some of the newer materials, the sales representatives in the field are only marginally aware of them and how they differ from their "main line" materials. Such a finding would certainly be consistent with that Brickell (1961, p. 38) found in New York: the farther one got from the state education department in Albany, the less supportive the department's employees were of change efforts.

Questions for Further Investigation

Reference has already been made to the fact that these three studies raise a number of questions that merit further investigation. It would be interesting to know, for example, how many of the schools that claim to have adopted a given set of materials have in fact implemented that set of materials in a manner somewhat consistent with what the developers had in mind. Also, the roles of representatives of commercial publishers and of textbook adoption policies certainly need some careful case studies; and correlations between school climate and adoption decisions need to be studied further. As organizations such as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers gain increasing power at the

local level, it will be important to consider their activities as possible sources of diffusion efforts as well as important variables related to adoption decisions. Hahn's puzzling finding that there is little correlation between perceptions of adopters and actual adoption decisions certainly merits the careful attention of researchers.

Is Reform Worth It?

In conclusion, one has to ask whether the massive effort at reforming the social studies has been worth it. Like so many things, it is a matter of perspective. Certainly the finding by all studies that large numbers of teachers are still unaware of the new materials could lead some to conclude that "the gas tank is half empty." But looked at another way "the tank is half full." Not only do a large number of teachers know about the materials, but the majority of users rate them as better than what they were using before and would recommend them to others. Those who gloomily predicted that the schools could not be changed and that national efforts always fail will have some problems in explaining away the increasingly widespread use of the "new social studies" materials.

Perhaps it is worthwhile to recall one of the key assumptions of the social studies materials reform movement, that is, that materials play a major role in setting the tone and direction of what goes on in social studies classrooms. Acting on that assumption, it was reasonable to engage in the systematic development and testing of social studies materials that offered educators real alternatives to what was in use. Only the most naive implied that new materials alone would change the basic nature of schools. The character of a school is at least partly the result of hundreds of day-to-day decisions on the part of teachers, students, administrators, school boards, and others. One of those decisions is that of a teacher to use a new two-week unit in a world history course; another is the decision of a school system textbook committee to adopt a new government package. Both have wider impact than simply on those classrooms where the materials are used.

It is neither a time to be discouraged nor elated. Change in education, like change in most fields, is a long, winding path that only

the most persistent seem able or willing to follow. The need for careful study of the change process continues to be as great as ever, though the three studies reported here contribute their own bits of useful information to a field of knowledge that seems to be in the "take-off" period.

References

Becker, James M., and Carole L. Hahn. *Wingspread Workbook for Educational Change Agents*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1975.

Brickell, Henry M. *Organizing New York State for Educational Change*. Albany, NY: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, 1961.

Felder, Rodney. "Requiem for a Dead College." *Harper's* (October 1975) p. 94.

Gaynor, Alan K. "The Study of Change in Educational Organizations: A Review of the Literature." Paper presented at the UCEA-Ohio State University Career Development Seminar, Columbis, Ohio, 1975.

Hahn, Carole L. "Relationships Between Potential Adopter's Perceptions of New Social Studies Materials and Their Adoption of Those Materials in Indiana and Ohio." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1975.

Havelock, Ronald G. *The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Havelock, Ronald G., and Mary C. Havelock. *Training for Change Agents: A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

Jwaideh, Alice R., and Gerald W. Marker. "A New Approach Toward Changing Social Studies Education." *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Spring 1973) pp. 5-29.

Pincus, John. "Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools." *Review of Educational Research*. Vol. 44, No. 1 (Winter 1974) pp. 113-144.

Rogers, Everett M., and F. Floyd Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1971.

Walker, Robert Edwin. "Factors Affecting the Implementation of National Project Materials in Social Studies Programs in Secondary Schools in Nebraska." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska, 1974.